

THE  
**RELIGIOUS MONITOR,**

OR

**Evangelical Repository.**

NO. 5.

OCTOBER, 1828.

VOL. V.

**Original Communications.**

FOR THE RELIGIOUS MONITOR.

**STRICTURES**

*On a series of papers entitled "Brief historical Sketches of the Associate Reformed Church of North America," published in the Religious Examiner, a periodical work edited by the Rev. Samuel Findlay, and printed at Cadiz, Ohio.*

[Continued from page 177.]

THE writer of the Sketches, after a very learned dissertation on the subordination of inferior courts to superior, &c. records, with a great deal of apparent gratulation, the fall of what he denominates the idol of subordination—This fall, he says, was occasioned by the refusal of the Associate Synod of Scotland to sustain an appeal from a decision of the Associate Synod in this country, proposing it as a previous question, whether the latter should be considered in a state of subordination to the former, which they decided in the negative.

What this idol of subordination is—This monster, that is supposed to have produced so much mischief to the cause of union in America, will appear to any one who will take the trouble to examine the act of the Associate Synod of Scotland, defining the connection between the two Synods, subjoined to our Testimony. And all that I shall observe on this, is—that, had not the Anti-burgher Synod been, at this time, far progressed in the same course of defection their Burgher brethren had been pursuing, they would, on this occasion, have acted as formerly, and in accordance with the spirit of that document. This idol is lustily attacked for its opposition to the union, out of which sprung the Associate Reformed church, which, (the writer says) "bade fair to do much for the interest of religion, without any disposition to bury truth for the sake of peace, as appears by the articles of union, which define explicitly (the writer should have said equiv-

ocally) the points that had been litigated; and by the many testimonies which they have since omitted against errors and delusions, which have given general satisfaction to the orthodox of all denominations." People are sometimes reduced to the necessity of praising themselves in consequence of a prevailing blindness of perception, on the part of others, to estimate their merits. This, must unfortunately be the case in relation to the Associate Reformed Church; which, though in the estimation and according to the representation of the writer of the Sketches, is a paragon of excellence; uniting in herself "all that is excellent in the seceder and covenanter churches;" yet is unperceived and unappreciated through their wondrous blindness and stupidity. But what the fruits of this union have been, and we are to estimate the character of the tree by its fruits, none, who are conversant with the history of the Associate Reformed Church, need be at any loss. (See on this subject an excellent little work, of Dr. John Anderson, entitled fruits of the union.) The baseness of the following insinuation must excite indignation in the breast of every lover of integrity and candour. Returning again to the opposition of the protesters of the union, which he designates as singular and unreasonable; and after referring to a letter said to have been written by Mr. Marshall, to a Mr. Telfair, previous to the union between the Burghers and Anti-burghers in America, in which he expresses his wish, (and which certainly ought to be the wish of every true disciple of the Lord Jesus,) that the Lord would heal the breaches of Zion; observes "as the suddenness of the change, in Mr. Marshall's mind, was certainly enigmatical, persons have attempted to account for it variously—some account for it as follows: The meeting house in Philadelphia, in which he, (Mr. Marshall) officiated as pastor, was incorporated, and a clause in the charter excluded from any interest in the church property, all who did not belong to the Associate Church in America, in subordination to the Associate Synod of Edinburgh. Wherefore, a fear of losing the meeting house, was supposed to be the real, though not the ostensible cause, of his opposition to the union; especially as refusing subordination was a condition of it. That this was the true cause, is the more probable, seeing the definition in the articles of union, is, in nothing inconsistent with the principles of Seceders." That such a base and unrighteous attack on the purity of the motives by which this holy man of God was influenced in his opposition to that most unscriptural union, should be made—an attack so directly opposed to that spirit which the gospel inculcates, and coming too, from one who professes himself a minister of the gospel, fur-

nishes a sad proof, (I must say it, though I am sorry that I should have it to say,) that the profession of the gospel, and the practice of it, are, indeed, different things. Had this been written by the Rev. Robert Annon, in the midst of party passions, it would not have been so criminal; but for one at this remote period from the date and scene of the contest, to sit down and deliberately write such a slander, is, to say the least of it, in the highest degree shameful and reprehensible. *Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon!*

The second communication on this subject, contained in the periodical work referred to, commences with some statements respecting the first fruit of the union. The enactment of the first constitution, which, though objectionable in a variety of respects, yet among others contains several important articles of truth, from which the Associate Reformed church, (as we shall afterwards see,) has now receded. The first article, in this document, contains a flaming profession of adherence to the system of truth laid down in the holy Scriptures and exhibited in the Confession of Faith, &c. with an exception as to those sections in the Confession of Faith "which define the power of civil government in relation to religion," which, for the present, they determine to say nothing about. After a laboured apology for this reservation, as implying in it, "nothing disrespectful to the Westminster divines, who, though eminent men, were liable to mistakes," &c. the writer proceeds to give us what he presumes a correct picture of the plain import of the reserved sections. "Their plain import," he says, "is, that the magistrate should establish a national creed, enforcing it on all his subjects by civil penalties, whether they can believe it or not—authoritatively call Synods, and judge of their decisions—ratifying when he thinks them right, and rejecting them when he thinks them wrong, and persisting till they renounce them and implicitly submit to his dictation." Now, that such a view of the power of the civil magistrate, never came into the heads of the assembly of divines at Westminster, and is only to be found in the writers own imagination, I dare venture to affirm. Such a representation, I consider in no other light than as a gross slander on that venerable body, the Rev. Andrew Wylie's admission of it, (as the writer affirms,) notwithstanding: for if we allow these worthies to speak for themselves, and compare their several statements on this subject with one another, the veriest child in knowledge, (laying aside writers of Sketches,) may apprehend the truth of what I assert. What says the Confession? chap. xxv. sec. 6.—"There is no head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ." And chap.

xxx. sect. 1, 2.—“The Lord Jesus Christ as King and Head of his church, hath appointed government in the hand of church officers distinct from the civil magistrate. To these officers the keys of the kingdom are committed.” Further, Confession chap. xxxi. sect. 3.—“It belongs to Synods and Councils ministerially to determine controversies of faith, and cases of conscience.”—And chap. xxiii. sect. 3.—“The civil magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the word and sacraments, nor the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven.” It is evident from these extracts, that in the view of the Westminster divines, (as they are called,) the magistrate must not claim a lordly supremacy over the church. That he must not interfere with her internal government. That as a magistrate, he must not assume to himself the office of a public judge of true and false religion, so as to dictate to his subjects in matters of faith,—and that he must not as a magistrate, take upon himself the administration of the ordinances, or any part of the government of the church. Moreover, if we believe that these divines were honest and consistent men, (and we have no evidence that they were not so, but the most substantial evidence to the contrary,) the questionable sections, left undetermined and reserved for future discussion, must be explained in accordance with those which we have extracted: and if so, will they warrant the belief, that “their plain import is, that the magistrate should establish a national creed, and enforce it on all his subjects by civil penalties, whether they can believe it or not !” No; never. I repeat, therefore, that this language can be considered in no other light than as a slander against that venerable body. It is, indeed, quite in accordance with the common slang of the day in which those worthies are accounted, and spoken of, as a parcel of narrow-minded, bigoted, dotard fools. It may be considered a matter of regret that some of our modern illuminati had not had their debut on the stage of existence a little sooner, that they might have favoured them with a portion of their light. We hope, that amid the other erasures, the Associate Reformed church has made in the Confession of Faith, she has not cut off the chapters and sections quoted above. But should it be so, the writer of the Sketches will find them in the good old Confession of the church, agreed upon by the assembly of divines at Westminster. That the language in the reserved sections is of doubtful import and capable, taken disconnected from the other statements made on the same subject, of being interpreted in a sense favouring an unwarrantable exercise of civil power in the officers of the church, is admitted. The act of the church of Scotland, approving of

this Confession, &c. passed in 1647, proceeds upon this principle, viz.—They declare that the magistrate's calling Synods without any other call, is to be understood of kirks not settled or constituted in point of government and not to the prejudice of the intrinsic power of the church received from Christ to call her own assemblies.

After thus exhibiting his views of the hated sections of the Confession of Faith, and furnishing a tedious and very dull defence of the Associate Reformed church in deferring for future discussion, the aforementioned sections of the Confession, the writer of the Sketches directs another arrow, from his well furnished quiver, against the Associate ministers, who, in their writings on the occasion, attacked them in this very vulnerable point.

"The Associate ministers," he says, "were the principal actors in this opposition, and yet their Testimony published the following year, plainly contradicts the reserved sections; (See pages 8, 9;) though, in the 7th page, they say, we declare our adherence to the whole doctrines of the Confession, &c. and have had contradictory terms of communion ever since in their church, to the grief of many of their adherents, and to the exclusion of others from their fellowship."

Now, I have no hesitation in saying, that this is another gross slander. Who told the writer of these Sketches that the Testimony of the Associate church, in the pages referred to, contradicts the reserved sections? Certainly the language contained in them says no such thing. Was the act of the General Assembly of Scotland, defining the sense in which the sections referred to, should be understood and received by the members of that church, a contradiction of the Westminster Confession of Faith? and has not the Confession of Faith been received always by the Secession church with the same reserve? and if even this act be not of sufficient latitude to embrace all the matters of doubtful interpretation, why should a further enlargement of it, as expressive of the sense in which the Associate church holds these, be deemed a contradiction of them? If, indeed, the Confession contained such monstrous doctrines on this subject, as the writer of these Sketches has endeavoured to palm upon it, the views of our Testimony might be regarded as indeed contradictory: but we can assure the writer of these Sketches, and we can assure his Associate Reformed brethren, if they are ignorant of it, that Seceders, and others too, from the very commencement of their existence to the present day, never entertained so low an estimate either of the talents or integrity of the Westminster divines, as to suppose

them capable of such gross contradictions as they must have been guilty of, if the writer's plain import of the reserved sections be true. They have never considered the matter in any other light than as one of doubtful interpretation; and therefore, have defined the sense in which they understand these sections. The writer of the Sketches, therefore, may spare his sympathy for the grieved adherents of the Associate body on account of her contradictory terms of communion. He will, perhaps, find ample occasion for it elsewhere. He may also congratulate himself on the successful exposure of these contradictory terms, as further helpful to the exclusion of many from her fellowship, and their welcome accession to the bosom of the Associate Reformed church, where "all that is excellent either in the Seceder or Covenanter churches is to be found."

After a very puzzling enquiry, viz. "whether every thing in the terms of communion, which a church holds, should be believed by all such as profess faith in them;" which the author for once, is so far orthodox as to decide in the affirmative: And after paying to the Associate Reformed church a few more compliments, for the great correctness of their procedure in not jumping into the dark and intricate subject of the civil magistrate's power, on the framing of their first constitution; but proceeding slowly and deliberately, until they were prepared unitedly to mutilate the Westminster Confession, by lopping the hateful sections and all other hateful things from it, and thus transformed, ~~and~~ it the Constitution and fixed Testimony of the Associate Reformed church.

He commences a lengthy and violent attack on the Associate body, for not uniting with them, on the occasion of the late overtures for union upon the basis of this worthy constitution and fixed testimony. It is introduced with the following remarks: "The Associate Synod in America, so far as we know, approve of the doctrine of the Associate Reformed Synod, on the subject of magistracy, as expressed in the overture, the act of 1790, and in the new edition of the Confession or constitution as it is called, and yet make the alteration an objection to union, as appears by the following quotation from a communication to the Associate Reformed Synod, 1823." Then follows an extract from this document which it is unnecessary to insert here, as the greater part of your readers are in possession of it. The writer, in commenting on the concession which the extract contains, viz. That in the constitution of the Associate Reformed church, no tenet is perceived to be contained contrary to our standards, and that in their views of the Westminster Confession, Catechisms

Larger and Shorter, Presbyterian Form of Church Government, and Directory for Worship, there is no difference,—Observes, “It is plain that they do not blame us with error on the magistrate’s power, nor in any thing else in our standards, relative to doctrine, worship, discipline and government; what then can be our fault, if not a want of veneration for the Westminster divines?” The writer adds further, “as this has given occasion to much contention and tended to perpetuate division where there is little difference in other things, perhaps not so much as in some cases they forbear with among themselves, it may be proper to quote at large that part of the reply of a communication of the Associate Reformed Synod of the west to the abovementioned communication of the Associate Synod, which respects this subject, as it sets the truth in a convincing light”. Then follows the document referred to, which contains a specimen of as uncandid and disingenuous conduct as perhaps the annals of modern ecclesiastical history can afford; the reading of which, before the Associate Synod, filled the minds of the members with one general swell of indignation at its jesuitical unfairness. No doubt the Associate Reformed brethren, like the writer of these Sketches, thought it a noble stroke of church diplomacy. We shall pass it over with the contempt to which it is entitled, and shall only notice the comments of our author upon it.

“However conclusive,” says he, after having furnished this reply at full length, “the above reasoning seems to be; the Associate Synod of Pittsburgh, (pray what Synod is this?) pronounced it unsatisfactory, and appointed a committee to address a letter to the Associate Reformed Synod, giving their reasons. They say, in that letter, they have been misunderstood—that the whole of the reply to our proposal to receive the Westminster Confession of Faith, just as it stands, proceeds on the supposition that we wished the united church to approve of every sentiment which *appears* to be expressed in the confession, on the power of the civil magistrate, and at the same time approve of the doctrine of the Declaration and Testimony on that head. On no other view of our proposal could it be said, that it would make the creed of the united church contradictory; and no view of our proposals could be farther from our design.” “But how,” the author of the Sketches vauntingly asks, “would or could the united church be understood otherwise than approving of every thing contained in the Confession and Testimony.” The author here craftily changes the phraseology of the committee. It is not approving every thing contained in the confession, but every sentiment which *appears* to be contained in it; and this very important al-

teration we can scarcely suppose to be without design. The Associate body never had the presumption to assert, that on this subject, the doctrine of the Confession was wrong, but that some of the language employed, (taken apart from the general import of the whole,) is capable of being interpreted in a sense injurious to the rights of the church. But they are far from asserting, that the compilers of the Confession designed them to be understood in this sense. In accordance with this is the language of the committee. "The reply proceeds on the supposition that we wish the united church to approve of every sentiment which *appears* to be expressed in the Confession." The remarks, therefore, of the author of the Sketches, to prove that they could not be understood in any other light, than that in which the reply regarded them, are futile and childish. He erects to himself a man of straw—proceeds right lustily to attack him, and having knocked him down, vaunts in triumph over him. The author further having, with amazing metaphysical subtlety, attempted to prove that *explanation* and *introduction* are synonymous terms, and having sharply rebuked the Associate body, for having, what, in his great wisdom, he considers contradictory terms of communion; his zeal for the dishonour thereby done to God and the cause of truth becomes fired, and wonderful to tell, he declares, "though all the world should join in such inconsistency, we are not to follow a multitude to do evil. The temple of God must not be built at the expense of truth and consistency." Now in good earnest, notwithstanding the hatefulness of the name, the author of the Sketches becomes a *testimony bearer*. "Further," says he, "why not endeavour to persuade our brethren of their mistake, in the hope of reclaiming them? When or where has gospel truth shrunk from a candid discussion? A case of this kind would truly be a new thing in the earth. But, in the present instance, it was especially necessary to use candour and freedom, seeing, in the contemplation of a union, it is insisted upon us, as a *sine qua non* in the formation of that union, that we adopt, with them, a self-contradictory creed. 'Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart; thou shalt in anywise rebuke thy neighbour and not suffer sin upon him.' This remarkable injunction, certainly implies, that in such cases of difference as subsist between us and our Associate brethren, it was right, properly, and calmly, and fairly, to reason the matter with them; not only in order that, being convinced of their error, they might be excited to reformation, but that they might repent and obtain forgiveness of God," &c. Surely the author of these Sketches is a *rare* *evil*—a *testimony bearear* in the Associate Reformed church.

Wonderful ! Surely he will lend his Herculean strength to the formation and publication of a testimony against Seceders; no longer of that doughty and hapless kind called occasional; which when once glanced over is committed to the shelf to become the sport of spiders to ornament with their cobwebs; but fixed and judicial. Surely they deserve this for their contradictory terms of communion; and surely it becomes them at their next meeting to tender you a vote of thanks.

The author further observes, "that the Associate body should bear the smart of the committee's lash, with all possible patience; for it was the committee's duty, [and doubtless it was a very painful one,] not only to state the objection, but to show its force; and this consequence they could not obviate. They never charge the inconsistency on them as intentional, [wonderful charity!] much less do they propose to require of them an acknowledgment of their sin, [singular moderation!] in having so long held a contradictory creed, which, indeed, must have done immense injury to the cause of religion, by its tendency to destroy sincerity, and to exclude the intelligent and conscientious from communion." Doubtless, this is truly a pity! The intelligent and conscientious have thereby been compelled to join the Associate Reformed church, that model of order and consistency, having in her creed ALL THAT IS EXCELLENT IN BOTH THE SECEDER AND COVENANTER CHURCHES! None are left to the Seceders but mere dunder pates!

The author, proceeding in his Brief Sketches, after having wandered for a season in the mazes of digression and bewilderment, falls foul of a minster of the Associate body, whom he emphatically designates a *licentiate* from Britain, and who had joined the *schismatics*. "They were led," says he "into this inconsistency by the rashness of a licentiate from Britain, in writing criticisms on the constitution of the Associate Reformed Synod, almost as soon as he landed on the American coast; consequently before he had time to inform himself of the state of the churches in America:" And after setting before us the operations of this redoubtable *licentiate* and *critic*, in storming the constitution of the Associate Reformed church, and particularly in attacking it on the very vulnerable point of the reserved sections in the Confession; the Sketcher, with eminent adroitness in his art, sets forth the mighty pickle the Associate body were in, on the publication of their Testimony, to steer clear of the same shoal on which the *barque* of the Associate Reformed church had foundered. "When they were preparing their Testimony, it would not do to make

the same reserve; for this would imply a censure on their critic, and destroy an engine to gain proselytes."

AMICUS VERITATIS.

(To continued.)

FOR THE RELIGIOUS MONITOR.

### JEHOVAH SMITING THE SHEPHERD---A SERMON.

"Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts: smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn my hand upon the little ones." Zech. xiii. 7.

THESE words have been variously explained and applied by commentators. Some have thought that Judas Maccabeus is the person, against whom the sword of the Lord of hosts is here commissioned. But it is evident, that the subject of prophecy, contained in this chapter, refers to a later period, even to the time of the Messiah. Some have fancied that they could perceive the picture of the Grand Turk to be here delineated, and his destruction foretold. Others have had the same notion about the Pope of Rome. Neither of these characters, however, could be called the *Shepherd* and the *fellow* of the Lord of hosts, excepting in an ironical manner. But irony, though sometimes used in scripture, appears to be totally inadmissible in such a solemn passage as this. Others have conjectured that christian rulers, civil and ecclesiastical, are here comprehended under the terms, *shepherd* and *fellow*, and that the text shows what such might generally expect, even the sword of persecution and death. But it is unnecessary, and would be unprofitable, to mention all the different views that interpreters have taken of this text. We are perfectly satisfied, for our part, with that view of it which our Saviour has taken and left on record. And nothing, we conceive, but a desire to be thought original, and to be wise above what is written, could ever have induced learned men to pass by that application which the great Prophet of the church himself has made of this deep and holy oracle. We are assured, that on the night in which he was betrayed and apprehended, he said to his disciples, "All ye shall be offended because of me this night; for it is written, I will smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered." Thus He, who moved the prophet Zechariah by his Spirit, to record the words of the text, has also condescended to become our instructor, in showing us their meaning and application. HE is the *Shepherd* and *fellow* of the Lord of hosts: HE was smitten to death by the sword of Jehovah's justice: and the

consequence of that deadly stroke was the scattering of the disciples, which was speedily succeeded by their happy recovery.

The manner in which the prophet introduces our text, appears to be somewhat abrupt; and to point out its connection with the preceding verses, is certainly difficult. At the tenth verse of the foregoing chapter, there is a prediction concerning the crucifixion of Christ; "they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and shall mourn for it." And this crucifixion of Christ is alluded to, in the first verse of the present chapter, as *the opening of a fountain for sin and uncleanness*; which purifying fountain is declared, in the second verse, to have this beneficial effect upon the church, *the purging away of idolatry and false teaching*.—But the church, in order to get rid of false doctrine, must exercise severe discipline upon the false prophet, which, accordingly, she is here declared to do: she kills him judicially, or excommunicates him. "Then his father and his mother [the church] that begat him, shall say unto him, thou shalt not live, for thou speakest lies in the name of the Lord; and his father and his mother that begat him, shall thrust him through when he prophesieth." And this discipline would be blessed; it would be the means of reclaiming the false prophet; *he would no longer wear a rough garment to deceive*; nay, he would confess that he was never called of God to the office of the ministry, and would betake himself to his former lawful employment, saying, "I am no prophet, I am an husbandman, for men taught me to keep cattle from my youth." And when interrogated respecting those wounds of discipline which he had received, he would confess that they had been inflicted in real friendship, and by his very best friends—*they were the wounds wherewith he had been wounded in the house of his friends*. "But, Oh, how different," says the inspired prophet, "will be God's dealing towards his own Son, the true Prophet! How infinitely more severe the discipline which he will exercise upon his Shepherd, the Man his fellow, in order that the church may be thus purged of her sin and uncleanness, her idols and false prophets! Methinks, I hear Jehovah's commission to the sword of Justice—Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, and against the Man that is my fellow; smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn my hand upon the little ones!"

This is one view of the connection, and perhaps the most natural and easy that can be given. However, there is another view of it, taken by some judicious divines, which is deserving of notice, on account of the application they make of the sixth verse to the crucifixion of our Lord. They suppose the Jewish nation

to be here the subject of prophecy; and that, after having been long wearied with false prophets and false christs, they will turn their attention towards Jesus of Nazareth, whom their fathers put to death, wondering if he were the true Messiah; but taking offence, as usual, at his cross, they will turn away in disgust with this caviling question, What are these wounds in thine hands? or, rather, as the time of their restoration is beginning to dawn, they will ask seriously, on purpose to have their prejudices against him removed, and their minds satisfied, what are these wounds in thine hands? Oh, tell us, if thou art the true Messiah, as we now begin to think thou art, what is the meaning of these wounds in thine hands? To whom he will cheerfully and graciously answer, "they are those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends;" by mine own nation and brethren after the flesh, according to the eternal, holy and gracious design of God, which may be expressed in these words, Awake, O sword, &c.

With regard to the term *sword*, it may be observed, that it sometimes in scripture signifies *persecution*; sometimes the *authority* with which the civil magistrate is clothed; and sometimes, *wicked men*, who are used by God as a sword in the execution of judgments. In all these respects was the sword raised against Christ. No sooner was he born, than the sword of persecution was brandished against him;—he died under the sword of the civil magistrate;—and wicked men, both Jews and Gentiles, as a sword in the hand of the God of judgment, were continually arrayed against him, until at length they pierced him through and were glutted with his blood. "He was taken by wicked hands and crucified and slain." Keen sufferings are also called a sword—and, assuredly this sword was infinitely keen against Jehovah's fellow; for it *dislocated all his bones, melted his heart like wax in the midst of his bowels, and poured out his soul unto death*. But here we are principally to understand the sword of divine justice; that sword which was bathed in heaven in the Redeemer's blood by an eternal decree; and which, on earth, was made drunk with his royal blood, and returned to its scabbard satisfied, and pleased to infinite quietness. This is the sword that receives in the text the prompt and solemn commission—"Awake, O sword, and smite the Shepherd."

And for the further elucidation of the subject we propose to consider,

- I. The person commissioning the sword.
- II. The person against whom it is commissioned.
- III. The commission itself, and

IV. The effects resulting from the execution of this commission.

I. The person commissioning the sword. And this is none other than the *Lord of hosts*. "Awake, O sword—saith the *Lord of hosts*." In the economy of redemption the three divine persons sustain different characters, and perform different works.—And though each of these adorable persons may be called, and is, the Lord of hosts, yet in this place the Father is evidently designated by that name; for it is his peculiar province and work to commission the sword of justice to awake against his Shepherd. And he appears here,

1. As clothed with all the *omnipotence* of the Godhead. He is the Lord of hosts; he created them, and he supports and governs them by his Almighty arm. Absolute and infinite power belongeth to Almighty God. And this omnipotence is wielded by the Father in managing the concerns of our redemption. He is clothed with it, when the sword receives its commission to awake; it *must* awake; and being awaked, omnipotence will see that it smites to the death.

2. He appears here as clothed with all the *authority* of the Godhead. He marshalls the hosts of heaven and assigns them their respective employments. They are all obedient to his voice. He saith to one come, and he cometh; and to another, do this, and he doeth it. The whole work of redemption and of grace, advances under his authority and according to his will. Even the Son and Spirit, in matters of grace, act by his authority; that is, by the authority of the Godhead, as personally possessed by him. Hence, the sword is *authoritatively* commissioned. In striking its deadly blow it can plead the *authority* of the Godhead.—For saith the Lord of hosts, *awake*, O sword, and *smite*.

3. He appears here as clothed with *judicial power*. This character belongs peculiarly to him in the economy of redemption.—He sits as Supreme Judge in all matters relating to sin and salvation. Accordingly it is not the sword of battle, but the sword of justice, that must be exercised in smiting the surety, and letting the sinner escape. A sentence must be pronounced, before the supposed guilty person can be executed. It is not, therefore, so much in the character of a Sovereign, as in that of a righteous Judge, that the Father commands the sword to *awake*, and *smite* his Shepherd.

4. He appears here as the stern *vindicator* of the claims of the Godhead. Sin had endeavoured to rob Jehovah of his glory.—It had insulted his holiness; it had braved his power; it had aimed a blow at his being; it had put his justice to the test, and

laughed at his truth. The daring outrage must be punished.—Due vengeance must be taken on sin. Every attribute of Deity is interested. Justice and holiness are particularly loud in their demands; and their demands shall be satisfied. And what, though a surety has stepped in, and taken the place of the sinner? And what, though this surety be God's own Son, his Shepherd, his fellow, most intimately related to him, and most tenderly beloved by him? Shall the claims of the Godhead sink? No; they shall be vindicated. The surety shall make ample reparation. Awake, O sword,—*smite the Shepherd*.

5. He appears here as the *God of Love*. His heart is most tenderly, and immoveably fixed upon the little ones of his eternal choice. But how, says divine love, swelling with anxiety and care, shall they escape the deadly stroke of the sword of justice, since they richly deserve to die? Says divine wisdom, "I have found a ransom," an all sufficient surety: The eternal Son consents to have the sword fall on him, and take its entire satisfaction, even to the burying of itself in the midst of his bowels.—Divine justice cordially approves the arrangement; and thus, the Father's love for his own Son, his only begotten and well beloved, appears to be less than his love for his people. For he prefers their salvation to his life; that *they might live, he must die!* In all the ardency of love to his chosen, he gives the summons, awake, O sword, *smite the Shepherd—and I will turn my hand upon the little ones*. Surely, then, does he appear here in the character of the God of love! "God hath commended his love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." O, the height, and the depth, and the length, and the breadth of the love of God! "Herein is love," love infinite and immeasurable, "not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins."

Lastly: He appears here under a *covenant* character. There are some, who would be thought masters in Israel, who deny the existence of a covenant of grace. They laugh at the idea of an eternal council held, and an eternal agreement formed between the Father and the Son. But, let me ask, does the Father lift the sword and smite the Son, without a mutual understanding, or agreement between them in relation to that smiting? How does the Son become the subject of penal discipline, since he is naturally and essentially holy, except by some covenant arrangement? Are we to suppose, that the Father exercises an arbitrary and unjust power against his Son, whom he acknowledges to be his co-equal and fellow? Let the blasphemous thought be far from our minds; and let us vindicate the character of Jeho-

vah, the holy one of Israel, by exercising an unshaken faith in the existence of an eternal covenant arrangement between the Father and the Son. The matter becomes plain and easy, and void of absurdities and blasphemies, when we consider, that,—“God, having out of his mere good pleasure, from all eternity, elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace, [with his Son in their behalf,] to deliver them out of a state of sin and misery, and bring them into a state of salvation.” It is, then, by virtue of this covenant, and in accordance with its terms; it is in order that the sins of the elect might be punished in the person of their surety, who had graciously undertaken to bear the burden of their debts, that the Father, clothed with all the omnipotence and authority of the Godhead, as Supreme Judge, as the vindicator of the claims of Deity, as the God of love, and in his covenant character, commissions the sword of justice: “Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow; smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn my hand upon the little ones.”

II. The second thing proposed, was to consider the Person, against whom the sword is commissioned. And this Person, as we have already intimated, is the Lord Jesus Christ. He is called in our text a *Shepherd*; and as such he bears a two-fold relation.

1. He stands related to his sheep, as every shepherd must necessarily do. And this relation implies,

1st. That he loves his sheep. And he loves them in a very peculiar manner; he loves them with an everlasting love. No date can be fixed upon as the beginning of his affection for them. From eternity his delights were with them, and his love immoveably placed upon them. Hence he addresses them—“Yea, I have loved thee with an everlasting love: therefore, with loving kindness have I drawn thee.” He loves them with the most ardent affection. Strange as it may appear, his love carried him even to death for their sake. He let the sword of justice fall on him, that these little ones might go their way. He says, and how wonderful the language! “I am the good Shepherd, I lay down my life for the sheep.” And, says an apostle, “Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word; that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing.” But he also loves them with an unchangeable affection. Whom he loves, he loves unto the end. No misconduct on their part will cause his love utterly to fail. They may not requite his love; they

may not obey his voice; they may not relish his dispensations; but still he will love them. He loved David, after he had awfully sinned against him; he loved Peter, after he had shamefully denied him; and he loved Paul, after he had wantonly persecuted him in his members; and he continues to love all his people, though they sin against him in times and ways innumerable.—For his language is, “the mountains shall depart and the hills be removed, but my loving kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord, that hath mercy on thee.”

2nd. That he feeds his sheep. He feeds them with spiritual food; food too, which does not grow spontaneously, but which he himself has provided. The green pastures on which they feed are the blessings of the everlasting covenant, which he purchased with his own blood. Such costly food, therefore, must be exceedingly delicious, incomparably excellent and nutritive; it is food which never palls upon the tongue, never loses its relish, and never destroys, but always quickens the appetite. And the drink which he provides, is of the same character. It is equally excellent. For they all drink of the river of God’s love, a river whose waters are pure, and healing, and inexhaustible, and which flows silently, eternally, and makes glad the city of our God. Hence, every one of his sheep may say with David, “The Lord, my Shepherd, maketh me to lie down in green pastures; he leadeth me beside the still waters; he restoreth my soul.”

3d. This relation implies that he protects his sheep. “He maketh his flock to rest at noon.” The sun of persecution may shine, the winds of temptation may blow, the clouds of difficulty may lower; the roaring lion and the ravenous bear may be chasing them for their blood; but still his sheep are safe: For they find in him, “a hiding place from the wind, a covert from the tempest, and the shadow of a great rock in a weary land.” Indeed, they need not fear Satan, death, nor hell; for, says this good Shepherd, and he is abundantly able to accomplish what he says, “I will give unto my sheep eternal life, and not one of them shall perish, neither shall any be able to pluck them out of my hand.” Well, therefore, might David sing, when experiencing the protection of the Shepherd of Israel,

Yea, though I walk in death’s dark vale,  
Yet will I fear none ill;  
For thou art with me; and thy rod  
And staff me comfort still, &c.

4th. As a Shepherd related to his sheep he governs them. He governs them by his word, which is his *rod and staff*; by his

Spirit, which he puts into their hearts, and which *conducts them to the land of uprightness*; and by the dispensations of his providence, in which they may read his pleasure. He governs them most righteously; for, "he leads them in the paths of righteousness:" most wisely; for, "he maketh all things work together for their good:" most authoritatively; for he makes them all to hear his voice, and become obedient to his will: and he governs them most tenderly; for, "he carries the lambs in his bosom, and gently leads those that are with young." But

2. Christ as a Shepherd is not only related to his sheep, but in this character he also sustains a certain relation to the Father.—He is the Father's Shepherd. "Awake, O sword, against *my* Shepherd, saith the Lord of hosts." Now, he is the Father's Shepherd in two respects.

1st. Because the sheep which he tends are the Father's property. Our Saviour does not claim exclusive possession. You have his language in the 17th chapter of John: "*All mine are thine:*" *mine* by right of donation and purchase; *thine* by right of eternal election. "Thine they were, and thou gavest them me." These sheep, therefore, are the Father's by virtue of his free, sovereign, and everlasting choice of them; and he has given them over into the care of his Son to tend them for him, and to conduct them home safely to the fold of glory. And hence he is the Father's Shepherd,

2nd. Because of his appointment to this office. He did not run unsent: he did not undertake to feed the Father's sheep without the Father's authority; he did not take to himself the instruments of a foolish shepherd, having no proper commission, no rightful employer, and no peculiar flock to manage: no, he received an everlasting appointment. He was "set up," to this office, "from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was." The Father chose and called him to be his Shepherd:—"Behold my Servant whom I uphold, mine elect in whom my soul delighteth." He clothed him with pastoral authority: "As the Father gave me commandment so do I." He laid upon him all the strayings of his sheep, and appointed him to die in their stead: "All we like sheep had gone astray; but the Lord laid upon him the iniquities of us all: he was oppressed, and he was afflicted." And having the Father's sheep committed to his care, he is accountable to the Father for them. He must restore them in full tale. When he comes "to deliver up the kingdom to the Father, that God may be all in all;" he must be able to say, Behold here am I, and the sheep that thou didest give me. Hard indeed has been my service; for, sin, Satan, and the world, have been con-

tinually endeavouring to climb the sheepfold, and to drag thence thy sheep, thy lambs. In the language of David my type, "thy servant kept his Father's sheep, and there came a lion and a bear, and took a lamb out of the flock; and I went out after him, and smote him, and delivered it out of his mouth; and when he arose against me, I caught him by his beard, and smote him and slew him: Thy servant slew both the lion and the bear." And thus, "Of all that thou hast given me I have lost none."

Again: The person against whom the sword is commissioned, is not only called a Shepherd, but is further described as "the man that is God's fellow." Here the two natures of Christ are designated. He is *man*; "the word was made *flesh*, and dwelt among us." "When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, *made of a woman*, made under the law." "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, *he also himself likewise took part of the same*." "He took on him *the seed of Abraham*." "He was made in the *likeness of sinful flesh*," &c. He was in every respect truly man. He possessed a human body and a human soul. His conception, however, being supernatural, he was born and ever continued without sin. It was said to Mary, a virgin of the family of David, "the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore, also, that *holy thing that shall be born of thee*, shall be called the Son of God." "Such an High Priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners." But he is more than man; he is Jehovah's *Fellow*. He possesses a *divine nature*; otherwise he could not be called the fellow or *companion* of the Lord of hosts. For this term implies *equality*: hence, Paul tells us, "that Christ, being in the form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God." It implies *sameness*: hence Christ says, "I and my Father are *one*." It implies, moreover, that he was the Father's delight, infinitely beloved by him, eternally lying in his bosom: "Then was I by him as one brought up with him; and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him." And this term also implies, that he was admitted to all the councils of the Father, an honour which never was nor will be conferred upon a creature: "For who hath known the mind of the Lord, and being his counsellor, hath instructed him?" "No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father he hath declared him."

But without enlarging, I would only remark further, that this Shepherd, this man God's Fellow, is here presented to our consideration, in the character of a *surety*. For in no other character could he be smitten by the sword of justice. He had engag-

ed, in the eternal covenant, to stand surety for the elect of God; to take their place under the law; to assume their guilt, and to expiate it by his death. And our text supposes, that the time has now come, when the surety must meet the demands of justice, when the awful sacrifice must be made, when the accursed death must be endured. All things are ready. The divine surety has assumed the human nature, and is in a state of actual preparation for cancelling all claims against the vessels of mercy. He has long enough groaned under the burden of their guilt, now he is ready to make the satisfaction, that both sinner and surety may be eternally released. The awful moment has arrived. Justice will wait no longer; it cries out for speedy vengeance. And the eternal Father, with the sword girt upon his thigh, looks upon the elect; O, it is a look of love; he looks upon their surety, and raises the revengeful shout, "Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow; smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered, and I will turn my hand upon the little ones." This brings us,

III. In the third place, to consider the *commission* which the sword here receives. And it is commissioned,

1. To *awake*. The word signifies to rouse up as from a state of sleep. It was long since sin had entered into the world; and the church, in common with the rest of mankind, was deeply involved in it; but her sins were not yet expiated, although many of her sons and daughters were enjoying in heaven all the blessedness of eternal life. It was long since Christ had engaged to pay her debt; but the payment was not yet made. And it was some considerable time since he had made his appearance in the flesh; but his soul was not yet poured out unto death. During all this period the sword of justice seemed to be asleep in its scabbard.—But now it is summoned to awake from this sleep of ages, to shake off its drowsiness, and execute the determinations of Jehovah upon the surety of God's elect. But the word also signifies to rouse up with joy and gladness. It had a glorious work to perform; it was going to obtain for itself an eternal renown.—It was not ignoble, common blood that it was summoned to drink, but royal blood, the blood of the Son of God, the Lord of life, and king of Zion. It was not against the sheep, but against the chief Shepherd, even the man Jehovah's fellow, that it was to be brandished for deeds of death. No wonder, then, that it awakes *rejoicingly* and pants for the onset. Henceforth, it will be satisfied; it will return to its scabbard crowned with honour, and will sleep in perpetual glory.

2. The sword is commissioned to *smite*; not only to *awake*, but

also to *smite*. And Oh, it did smite! At one stroke, it threw the Shepherd into an awful agony, and started the blood from every pore of his body. "Being in an agony—his sweat was, as it were, great drops of blood falling down to the ground." At another stroke, it wrested from him the last particle of comfort; it eclipsed the light of the Father's countenance, and made him verily think that his own Father and God had utterly forsaken him. "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" And at another stroke, it made an entrance into his heart and drank up the blood of his life; "and he bowed his head and gave up the Ghost." This was smiting, effectual smiting indeed. And no wonder, for the sword was edged and pointed with the unmixed wrath of an infinitely incensed God, and was wielded by the omnipotent arm of the Lord of hosts.

On the *character* of this smiting, I might observe, that it was,—

1. *Legal*. So far as human agents were concerned in the death of Christ, the greatest injustice was practised. He had, indeed, the colour of a trial; and was condemned by the highest judicature of the Jewish nation, whose deed was also sanctioned by Pilate the Roman Governor. He was, nevertheless, condemned unjustly; being entirely innocent of all the charges that malice and envy had alleged against him. He was taken by *wicked* hands, and crucified and slain. But the smiting of the Son of God, viewed in relation to Jehovah, and as his judicial deed, was most legal and just. He deserved to be smitten by the sword of justice; for he was found laden with an infinite load of guilt, not indeed of his own contracting, but imputed guilt, even the guilt of the whole elect of God. God, therefore, as the Supreme Governor and righteous *Judge* of the universe, most justly sentenced him to death. This smiting, then, was in strict conformity to the eternal rectitude of the unalterable law of heaven.—

2. *Vicarious*. Our Lord was not smitten for any fault of his own. He was personally innocent. The scriptures declare, that he had done no violence; that deceit was never found in his mouth; that he was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners. Even his enemies, and persecutors, were compelled to acknowledge his innocence. Mark informs us, that "the chief priests and all the council sought for witnesses against Jesus to put him to death, but found none; for many bare false witness against him, but their witness agreed not together." Judas, even the traitorous Judas, smitten with the enormity of his sin, came with his ill-gotten money in his hand and confessed; "I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood." And Pilate was constrained to testify of his innocence, saying, "I find no

fault in him." Now, how are we to account for the sufferings of *the holy child Jesus*? The wages of sin, we are told, is death.—But here we have a person, of whom the Spirit of truth declares, that "*he knew no sin*," undergoing death in its most accursed form. His sufferings, then, can never be accounted for, but on the supposition that they were *vicarious*. When the sword of justice, therefore, awoke against him, and smote him down to the dust of death, he must have been really and truly the *substitute of sinners*. Hence, the emphatic language of divine truth;—"God hath made him, who knew no sin, to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.." "Christ also hath once suffered for *sins*, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." "He bare our sins in his own body on the cross." "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows. He was wounded for our transgressions," &c.

3. *Penal*. This necessarily follows from what has already been said; for if the smiting of Jehovah's fellow was legal and vicarious, it must also have been penal, that is, constituting a *real punishment for sin*. This, indeed, is denied by many. They suppose that Christ's sufferings were inflicted merely to confirm the truth of the doctrines which he had preached, and to set mankind an example of patience, meekness and resignation. No doubt, by his sufferings, our Saviour did do all this. But these ends were only circumstantial and subordinate. According to this view of Christ's sufferings, nothing was obtained, no end subserved, but what might have been procured by the sufferings of his apostles. For what stronger evidence could we desire for the truth of the gospel; what brighter example of meekness and fortitude could we wish for, than are afforded us in the persecutions, tortures and deaths of the apostles and martyrs of Christ? And if others urge that these sufferings of the Son of God were inflicted, only to afford us an expression of God's abhorrence against sin, and of his determination to punish it; we answer, that, though this lesson is powerfully taught us in the sufferings of Christ, yet the sufferings of a sinner, say a Unitarian or a Hopkinsian, would have answered the same end. And, indeed, this was already superceded by the sufferings of the apostate angels, who, ever since the first entrance of sin into our world, have existed the awful monuments of God's displeasure against sin, and of his determination to punish it. The grand and ever-blessed design of God, in smiting his Son in this awful manner, therefore, was that the penalty of a broken law might be exhausted, and the redemption of his people secured. The expressions, *he bare our sins*; *he suffered for the unjust*; *he was wounded for our transgressions*, and

*bruised* for our iniquities; the Lord *laid on him* the iniquities of us all, and such like, forcibly impress upon us the idea of penal suffering. Being substituted in the room of his people, it behooved him to suffer the punishment incurred by their sins. Being made under the law, it was necessary that he should cancel its imperious demands. Here there could be no compromise; though he was God's own Son, the honour of the law must be maintained. For sooner might heaven and earth pass away, than that one jot or tittle should fail from the law till all was fulfilled. There could be no alternative in the case. The justice of God must either be satisfied, or the redemption of the soul must cease for ever. But the penalty was endured. "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law." And how? By *being made a curse for us*. A stronger term could not be used to express penal suffering: "he was made a *curse* for us." We do not say, however, that Christ's sufferings were precisely the same in every respect, that ours would have been, had no substitute been provided. They were greater in intensity, but shorter in duration. But we unhesitatingly assert, that they were amply equivalent to the demerit of all his people, and were accepted as such by the eternal Father. The dignity of his person gave infinite merit to his sufferings; and though they were limited as to duration, they were every way adequate to liberate the sinner from those, which, on his part, must have been eternal. This is the scriptural view of the Redeemer's sufferings; and to consider them in any other light, is to blaspheme our God, and render our salvation utterly impossible.

Lastly; this smiting was satisfactory to justice. It formed a complete atonement for sin. As Christ's eternal engagements bound him to satisfy all the demands of law and justice in behalf of those whom he represented, so these were amply fulfilled, when, in time, "he bare our griefs and carried our sorrows;" when, upon the cross he cried out in the triumphant accents of victory and joy—IT IS FINISHED. The debt was then completely and satisfactorily cancelled. Justice acknowledged a perfect payment; and both the sinner and the surety were acquitted for ever. With this smiting Jehovah was infinitely well pleased; in it, as an atoneing sacrifice, he smelt a savour of rest; and as an incontestible evidence of its propitiatory and satisfactory nature, he raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory—"he highly exalted him, and gave him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth;

and that every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

IV. Of the effects resulting from the execution of the commission which the sword receives.

And there are two effects mentioned in the text.

1. The scattering of the sheep. "Smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered" This predicted effect was truly and literally verified, in the flight of the disciples, when their Lord was apprehended, tried and condemned. It is written concerning them, that *they all forsook him and fled*. And to this circumstance our Saviour himself applies these words of the prophet.—This conduct of the disciples was exceedingly criminal. It showed the greatest ingratitude to their master, who had done so much for them. It was a fearful violation of promises and engagements, the most solemn and voluntary. "Though all men should deny thee," said Peter, "yet will not I; and so said they all."—But inglorious, base and criminal as such conduct was, let our censures be sparing. For circumstances combined to produce that conduct, which will never have place again. It was the determinate counsel of heaven, that the Redeemer should be *solitary* in his sufferings; should have none to administer to him the least word of comfort, or perform for him the smallest act of kindness; that there should be no alloy, or mixture of satisfaction, in the cup which was given him to drink; nay that he should tread the winepress alone, and that of the people, there should be none with him. In accordance with this design, an hour of grievous temptation was permitted to fall upon the disciples. The night, in which they scattered, was fearfully dark and gloomy. In the language of scripture, "it was the hour and power of darkness." But still the grace of God could have sustained them against all the power and malice of hell, and have carried them through triumphant; that grace, however, was wisely withheld; and the consequence was, while the Shepherd was smitten, the sheep were scattered.

2. The other effect consequent upon this smiting, as mentioned in the text, is Jehovah's *turning his hand upon the little ones*. By the *little ones*, we are primarily to understand the disciples of our Lord. They had basely deserted him in the hour of his sufferings; yet Jehovah turned his *hand upon them*, instead of having turned his *sword against them*, to punish them for their perfidy. Yes, *the sword* was lodged in the heart of the Shepherd, but upon them, his frightened and scattered sheep, *the hand* was turned. This was realized in their preservation from the power of their enemies, during the period of their temptation and trial,

while their Lord was dying and was dead; in their being gathered to him after his resurrection; in their being blessed with the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost, after his ascension; and finally, in their being accepted in their work, and received into glory.

But the effect, resulting from the smiting of the Shepherd, as predicted in the text, has a further and more extended reference, and can only receive its full realization in the gathering together into Christ of all the children of God, who were represented and purchased by the Redeemer, and who are scattered abroad throughout all nations and all generations. They are *little ones*,—*little* in their own estimation, yea, less than the least of all God's mercies,—*little* in the estimation of the world, being regarded as the very *offscouring of all things*—*little* on account of their comparative fewness, *a little flock*—and *little*, because of their spiritual helplessness; being unable to *think* any thing as of themselves; unable to *walk*, but as God leads them by the hand and teaches them to go; and unable to *work*, but as God works in them both to will and to do of his good pleasure. But though they are little ones, Jehovah is their friend; upon them his hand is turned; that is, by smiting the Shepherd, he became reconciled to them; his anger is appeased, his enmity is removed, he offers them his hand; and it is a hand full of kindness, to assist them in all their difficulties; a hand full of grace, for their justification, adoption and sanctification; and a hand full of glory, for their eternal felicity in realms of light, where they shall be like Christ their Redeeming Head, and shall reign with him for ever and ever.

#### REFLECTIONS.

1. How holy and just is our God! "Evil cannot dwell with him, nor the foolish stand in his sight. He is glorious in holiness; his righteousness is like the great mountains. Our God is a consuming fire." He cannot look upon his violated law, without indignation against the transgressors; he cannot receive any of them into his favour, without a satisfaction to his justice. So pure is his holiness, so unbending his justice, that the sins of his chosen must be punished in the person of their surety. If they are to be acquitted, he is to be condemned—if they must live, he must die. Hence his judicial mandate: Sword of justice, awake and smite the Shepherd, even the man my fellow; and I will turn my hand upon the little ones.

2. How amazing the wisdom and love of our God! Salvation from eternal punishment, through the sufferings of a substitute, could never have entered the dreams of created wisdom; and

even if it had, such wisdom would have been eternally confounded in selecting a substitute adequate to meet the demands of law and justice. Well then may we exclaim, when reflecting upon the wisdom of God in devising the method of our salvation, "O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God!" Surely the wisdom, here displayed, is infinite; far beyond all created comprehension; for, not only is the sinner saved, but all the divine perfections are glorified, are covered with an eternal, harmonious lustre; "mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other." But the love of God is equally great and astonishing. To save from deserved punishment, sinners, worms of the dust, who had rebelled against him and bade him defiance, he brandished the sword against his own eternal and well beloved Son, and cleft him down to the dust of death. Meditate upon the following passages of divine truth, till your love for him be kindled into a flame. "God so loved (it is impossible to tell how much) the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life." "Scarcely for a righteous man will one die, yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die: but God commendeth his love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners Christ died for us!" "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be a propitiation for our sins."

3. How wonderful, also, is the love and condescension of Christ our surety! We know not which to admire the more, the love of the Father as manifested towards us in smiting the Son, or the love of the Son in enduring the stroke. Indeed, both are infinite, and both are equally worthy of our eternal admiration and praise. The love of Christ, viewed separately, may be seen reigning throughout the whole work of our redemption, from its commencement to its termination: but it appears with a peculiar brightness and grandeur, during the period of his sufferings, when he heard the revengeful shout, "Awake, O sword, and smite the Shepherd," and when, during the execution of that commission, he was made to exclaim, now is my soul sorrowful—exceeding sorrowful—sorrowful even unto death! Nay, was forced, as the agonies of death increased and strengthened, to raise the plaintive cry after a departed God, *Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani*? Verily, brethren, there is in this love of Christ, a height and depth, a length and breadth, which passeth knowledge!—O! "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, though rich, yet for our sakes, became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich."

4. How certain is the salvation of the people of God! The price of their redemption has been fully paid. Due vengeance has been taken on all their sins in the vicarious sufferings of Christ. The sword, which they deserved, has fallen with all its weight upon him. In justice they must be saved. God is bound by his covenant engagements to bestow upon them eternal life.—Indeed, should one of the least of them be cast into hell, the redeeming blood of the Lamb of God would cry out *injustice, unfaithfulness*. However much deceived and deceiving men may talk about Christ's death not securing the salvation of any, be assured, Christ speaks a different language: "I lay down my life for my sheep—and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand." And the apostle Paul, in rapturous assurance, echoes the language of his Master: "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth? *It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.*" With such language, also, our text beautifully accords; for it declares, that the Shepherd being smitten, Jehovah *will turn his hand upon the little ones*, in whose room he was smitten.

5. What a fearful thing is sin! *Its wages are death*. Its guilt is so black and so deep that it cannot be gratuitously pardoned.—Either the sinner must die, or a substitute of infinite dignity in his place. "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission." Even the chosen people of God could not be pardoned and received into his blissful presence on high, had not the fury of the sword of justice been quenched in the blood of their divine surety. To contradict this, would be to convert the wisdom of the Allwise into folly, and to represent the righteous Judge as inflicting unnecessary suffering, which must always be regarded as an act of wanton cruelty. In the death, therefore, of God's Son, the guilt and malignity of sin appear in fearful and horrific form. Oh! who can reflect upon that death in which the holy and just One was made a *curse*, was immersed in hell torments, without being convinced that sin is that *abominable thing which God's soul hateth*? Let us, then, hate sin with a perfect hatred. Let us carefully avoid the commission of it. And above all things, let us seek its forgiveness in the blood of the atonement; that, "though our sins be as scarlet, they may become as the snow, and though red like crimson, they may become as the wool."

6. How awful and inevitable will be the destruction of unbelievers! By not taking refuge under the blood of the everlast-

ing covenant, by not receiving Christ as an atoneing sacrifice for their sins, the sword, that smote him, will awake against them, and continue smiting them to all eternity. And if its operations were so dreadful and excruciating upon him who had divinity to sustain him, how shall they be endured by mere creatures, who, in comparison with him, are but puny worms of the dust! And let them never think for a moment, that there is the smallest hope of escaping before the swift foot of punitive justice. Swift destruction *shall* overtake them. Damned they *must* be. They *shall* be given as food to the worm that never dies, and as fuel to the fire that is unquenchable. In addition to all their other guilt, they have added this—by their unbelief and wilful rejection of Christ—“They have crucified him afresh and put him to an open shame—they have trodden under foot the Son of God—counted the blood of the everlasting covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and have done despite unto the Spirit of grace!” Their damnation, therefore, is inevitable.—How shall they escape, after having neglected the great salvation? Let sinners, therefore, think of these things: Let them awake from their sleep of carnal security; and let them believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and *they shall be saved*. “Oh! that they were wise, that they understood this, that they would consider their latter end.”

Finally: With what grateful remembrance should believers contemplate the sufferings of their Lord! Ingratitude here is a foul, is a rank offence against that holy and just One, “who gave his back to the smiters, and his cheeks to them who plucked off the hair;” and whose body still exhibits the print of the wounds inflicted by the sword of Jehovah’s justice. Should not every believer here say of Christ, who loved him and gave himself for him, as the captive children did of Jerusalem at the rivers of Babylon? “If I forget thee, let my right hand forget her cunning; if I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth.” Christ’s death should never be forgotten. It cannot be by those who love him. They will remember it in secret, and *commemorate* it in public. They will engage with cheerfulness and with joy in the celebration of that ordinance, which Christ himself instituted in the ever memorable night in which he was betrayed; and which he designed to perpetuate the remembrance of his death in the church till the end of time. While, then, the saints above are contemplating with wonder and admiration, with gratitude and praise, *Jesus Christ and him crucified*, and are tuning their golden harps in grateful remembrance of his sufferings; let us, on earth, catch the generous

theme, let us love, let us admire, let us *remember* the Lord of life in his sufferings and death; and soon we shall be admitted to sing with them in realms of glory and bliss—"To him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. AMEN.

## Selections.

### AN ANTIDOTE AGAINST ARMINIANISM.

[ Continued from page 181.]

#### OBJECTIONS AGAINST PARTICULAR REDEMPTION ANSWERED.

Objection 1. *What every one is bound to believe, must be true; and it is the duty of all men to believe; therefore Christ must have died for all men.*

Answer 1. Suppose we *grant* this position, would not the doctrine of *discriminating love* be thereby destroyed? Would it not be *poor* comfort for a *distressed* soul, to believe that Christ died for it, no more than for Judas, and all the damned in hell?

2. They to whom the gospel never came, they who have never *heard* of the death of Christ, are not bound to believe that Christ died for *them*. What God *reveals* is true; but God no where reveals, or saith, that it is *his* intention that Judas shall believe, or that *all* shall believe.

3. *All* have not the gospel preached to them; and many to whom it is preached only *hear* the sound thereof with the *outward ear*; they come and go, in an attendance thereon, as the door upon its hinges, in a way of mere formality. They are not impressed with a sight and sense of their state as sinners. They are not weary and heavy laden, because of sin. The proclamation by the gospel trumpet, of redemption for sin through Christ's blood, is not a joyful sound to them; they know not *their need* thereof. Evangelical repentance is the gift of free grace; faith is the gift of God. What is God's as a gift to bestow, cannot be man's *duty* to perform as a *condition* of salvation. Those who are *invited* to look to Christ, to come to him for salvation, are *very minutely described*: they are the weary and heavy laden with sin, the penitent, the hungry and thirsty soul, &c. &c. these are the characters invited to come to, and believe in Christ, and *not all men*.\* Matt. xi. 28. Isaiah lv. 1. Mark ii. 17.

\* It is true, that "the weary," &c. are particularly invited; and it is equally true, that all, to whom the gospel is preached, are invited. "Go preach the gospel to *every creature*." Now, the *offer* of Christ is the very marrow of a preached gospel. "*Whosoever will, let him come*." See Testimony, p. 93.

**Objection 2.** *The words ALL and EVERY, often used in scripture, must not be taken universally.*

**Answer 1.** ALL and EVERY, must not be taken for an universal affirmative, and for every man individually, in the common quoted scriptures; but *distributively*, as in Matt. ix. 35, where we are told that Christ went about healing *every* sickness and *every* disease among the people; that is, any and every *kind* of disease, for Christ healed not *every* disease, individually. Also in Col. i. 28. where *all* and *every*, is taken distributively three times over, and must be restricted to those Paul preached to.

2. *All* in 1 Tim. ii. 4. cannot be taken for every man individually, neither for all collectively; since it is not the *will* of God that all men in this *large* sense should be saved: for it is his will, that *some* men should be *damned*, and that very justly, for *their* sins and transgressions. Unto *some* men it will be said, *depart ye cursed into everlasting fire*. If God *willeth* all men to be saved, then, *all men will be saved*, for HE (God) *doth according to his WILL in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth*. Dan. iv. 35. God faileth not, he cannot be disappointed in his own will; for he worketh all things after the counsel thereof.\* Again, in Heb. ii. 9. Jesus is said to taste death for *every man*; it is in the very next verse restricted to "sons brought to glory" and in verse 11, to "sanctified" ones. 1 Tim. ii. 6. (who gave himself a ransom for *all*) is rendered in the parallel text in Titus ii. 14, who gave himself for *us*. Now who are the persons called, *us*, in this text? Are they not *particularized* as, "redeemed from all iniquity, purified and made a peculiar people?" For *all* of this description, Christ gave himself

\* "I rather think that by ALL MEN, in 1 Tim. ii. 4. are meant the GENTILES, who are sometimes called the WORLD, the WHOLE WORLD, and EVERY CREATURE. Rom. xi. 12. 15. 1 John ii. 2. Mark xvi. 15, which is the sense, I apprehend, in which it is used in verse 1, where the apostle exhorts, that, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanks, be made FOR ALL MEN, for KINGS, and for all in authority; which was contrary to a notion that obtained among the Jews (of whom there were many in the primitive churches) that they should not pray for HEATHENS and heathen magistrates. The apostle enforces this exhortation from the advantage which would accrue to themselves, "that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty;" besides, says he, "this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men (GENTILES as well as JEWS) to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth," and therefore has sent his ministers to preach the gospel among them. For there is one God, of JEWS and GENTILES; who by his gospel, has taken out of the LATTER a people for his name and glory. Seeing then, there are some JEWISH notions pointed at, in the context, and the whole is adapted to the state and case of the GENTILES, under the gospel dispensation, there is a good deal of reason to conclude that THEY are designed here: whereby another principle of the Jews is confuted, which is, that the Gentiles should receive no benefit by the Messiah, when he came; and is the true reason of MOST, if not of ALL, those UNIVERSAL expressions, relating to the death of Christ, we meet with in scripture." Gill, on 1 Tim. ii. 4, in his "Cause of God and Truth." A great work, rightly entitled; and is surely a death's blow at the root of Arminianism.

a ransom, and for none else. The word *all* is likewise rendered *many*, as was shewed in page 181.

The prophet David saith, *All men are liars*, take the word *strictly*, and he must be a liar that said so.

Objection 3. In John iii. 16, and 1 John ii. 2, it is declared that *God gave Christ for the world, and for the sins of the whole world*; which must be taken literally.

Answer 1. The word "*world*" is of various significations. A decree went out that *all the world* should be taxed, Luke ii. 1, that is, *the Roman empire*, and the countries in subjection thereto. The faith of the church of Rome, was spoken of throughout *the whole world*, Rom. i. 8, that is, throughout all the *churches*, and among all the *saints* in the world. When the pharisees said of Christ, "*behold the world is gone after him*," (John xii. 19.) by reference we find they meant the "*much people*" who went out of Jerusalem to meet Jesus crying hosannah, verse 12, 13. The pharisees themselves, who *so* said, were not gone after Christ. So John iii. 16. *God so loved the world*, cannot be understood of the world containing, in a strict sense, for so birds, beasts, fishes, and all inanimate things are comprehended, which cannot have everlasting life; nor can it be the world of *men* but as God is the preserver of both *man* and *beast*, Psal. xxxvi. 6. There is God's love to *creatures*, his love to *men*, and his love to *good men*. God's love was the cause of sending Christ; and the word *who-soever* (in this verse) restrains this love of God to *some*, and not to *others*: It must therefore be properly God's love to *good men*, the third love, not such as he *found* good, but such as he *made* so.

2. There is the world of *believers*. Rev. v. 9, and as *manna* was only for Israel, so Christ, the true manna, the bread from heaven, gives life to the world of believers only. John vi. 33, Christ was *believed on* in the world of believers only, 1 Tim. iii. 16. the reconciled world, 2 Cor. v. 19, and *all men have not Faith*, 2 Thess. iii. 2. There is also the world of *unbelievers*. *All the world wondered after the beast, and worshipped the dragon*, Rev. xiii. 3, 4. *The whole world lieth in wickedness*. 1 John v. 19. The believing world is a world *in the world*, (*these are in the world*, John xvii. 11.) and they are taken and chosen *out of the world*. They are *in the world*, and sojourning among the inhabitants thereof as *strangers* and *pilgrims* only, this not being their *rest*, their *home*, their desires being toward a better country, Heb. xi. 13—16. And that they are taken and chosen *out of the world* and given to Christ, is clear from John xv. 19. *If ye were of the world, the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world*

hateth you. Also from John xvii. 6. 9. *I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world. I pray for them, I pray not for the world.*

Zion's a garden wall'd around,  
Chosen, and made peculiar ground;  
A little spot, enclos'd by grace,  
Out of the world's wide wilderness.

3. It is granted that God hath a respect for all mankind; we trust (saith Paul) in the living God, who is the Saviour, *i. e.* the preserver, of all men, *especially of those that believe*, 1 Tim. iv. 10. The Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works, Psal cxlv. 9. he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good; and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. Matt. v. 45. All this implies not *eternal* preservation, but only temporal providence and *reservation*.

4. The *world*, is sometimes in Scripture put for *Gentiles* in opposition to *Jews*, and so it is in 1 John i. 2. John wrote to the *Jews*, and ministered unto the *circumcision* (see Gal. ii. 9.) and he says unto *them*, Christ is the propitiation for our sins, not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world; that is, *not for us Jews only, but for the Gentiles also*. The Jewish nation considered themselves as the peculiar people of God; and so they were, for to *them pertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises*. And Christ was a Jew, of whom as concerning the flesh, Christ came, Rom. ix. 4, 5. The Jews were always taught to appropriate the Messiah *exclusively to themselves*, to the utter rejection of the *Gentiles*, who were called strangers, uncircumcised, common, unclean, dogs, &c. And it was unlawful for a Jew to keep company or have any dealings with a Gentile, Matt. x. 5. Mark vii. 17. Acts x. 28, and xi. 3. The salvation of the Gentiles is in various parts of scripture called, *a mystery*, a *hidden mystery*; the mystery of Christ, which in other ages was not made known to the sons of men, that the *Gentiles* should be fellow-heirs, Eph. iii. 4—6. Col. i. 27. But when this mystery was revealed and made fully known by the divine mission to Paul, who was by Christ sent to preach to the Gentiles, Acts xxvi. 17, 18, when it was declared by the vision of the unclean beasts and the Lord's consequent commission to Peter, Acts x. 9—15. 20. then the contentions of the circumcision ceased, Acts xi. 2, 3; they found the middle wall of *partition* between Jew and GENTILE was broken down; the latter, who before were *aliens* from the common-wealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of promise, being now brought nigh by the blood of Christ: They

glorified God, saying, *Then hath God also to the GENTILES granted repentance unto life.* Jesus Christ is not only the propitiation for the sins of us JEWS, but for the GENTILES also, Eph. ii. 11—18.

5. The foregoing is proved from Rom. xi. 21, where the two words, *World* and *Gentiles*, are both used as signifying one and the same thing. *If the fall of the Jews be the riches of the WORLD, and the diminishing of them the riches of the GENTILES; how much more their fulness?*

“It was a controversy agitated among the Jewish doctors, whether, when the Messiah came, the *Gentiles*, the *WORLD*, should have any benefit by him; the majority was exceeding large on the negative of the question; only some few, as old *Simeon* and others, knew that he should be a light to lighten the *Gentiles*, as well as the glory of the people of *Israel*. The rest concluded, that the most severe judgments and dreadful calamities would befall the *Gentiles*; yea, that they should be cast into Hell, in the room of the *Israelites*.”—GILL.

Objection 4. Surely Christ hath as much efficacy to save, as Adam to damn. See Rom. v. 18.

Answer 1. There is a difference between a necessary extension, and a voluntary one; Adam's sin was extensive necessarily, but salvation by Christ is of free grace, wholly of God's pleasure, and is therefore called the free gift. Rom. v. 15.

2. Christ is no where compared to Adam in the extent of his object, but only in the efficacy of his obedience. All, and every one, are not in Christ radically, as they were in Adam; all are not given to Christ; but, *As many* (saith Christ) *as thou hast given me.* And as all the offspring of Adam fell by his sin, so all the offspring of Christ are saved by his death; as all that are in Adam die, so all that are in Christ are made alive. 1 Cor. xv. 22. And in verse 23 the characters made alive are particularly described; it is, *they that are Christ's.*

3. That the Apostle might not be misunderstood, and the word, ALL, in Rom. v. 18. taken universally, the term of comprehension is varied in the following verse, and ALL is rendered MANY. *By the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous.*

Objection 5. In Rom. xiv. 15, it is said *destroy not him for whom Christ died.* And in 2 Peter ii. 1. persons are described as *denying the Lord that bought them.*

Answer 1. Everlasting destruction cannot be intended by the word, *destroy*, in Rom. xiv. 15, and the context shews this; for the apostle, throughout the chapter, is exhorting the believing Romans not to condemn or condemn one another on account of

things indifferent; neither to destroy the weak believer's peace of mind, by doing any thing (which although it be indifferent, and not evil in itself) may yet prove a stumbling block to him. "I am persuaded (says Paul) that there is nothing unclean of itself; but to him that *esteemeth* any thing unclean, to HIM it is unclean. If thy brother be grieved with thy *meat*, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not by thy conduct (in eating meat esteemed by thy brother unclean) the peace of mind of one of the weaklings of that flock for whom Christ died. Put not a stumbling block, or an occasion of falling or offence, in thy weak brother's way," Rom. xiv. 13—16. *Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God. GIVE NONE OFFENCE*, 1 Cor. x. 31, 32. To the same purport is, 1 Cor. viii. throughout.

2. The persons spoken of in 2 Peter ii. 1. as *denying the Lord that bought them*, are described by the apostle thus, "*FALSE TEACHERS*," hypocritical professors, tares among the wheat, Matt. xiii. 25. 38, in whom was never *the root of the matter*: Not bought and redeemed by Christ from eternal death, but, had merely escaped, or *abstained*, from the pollutions of the world, through a *theoretical* knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, verse 20. To answer certain purposes, they made an *outward* profession of the gospel, which obliged them for a space to be *outwardly moral*; associated with the people of God, insinuated themselves into churches\* privily introduced therein *damnable heresies*, many followed their pernicious ways, by reason of whom, the way of truth was evil spoken of, and they made merchandize of true believers; they continued thus for a while, and then, either their *sheep's clothing* (Matt. vii. 15.) was stripped off them, or they threw it off themselves, and returned back again into the world. They were all this while, goats, not sheep; ravening wolves, not gentle lambs: And Peter closes the chapter concerning them by saying, *It is happened unto them according to the true proverb. The DOG is turned to its own vomit again; and the sow, that was washed, to her wallowing in the mire*, 2 Peter ii. 1—3, 17—22.

3. The apostle in 2 Pet. ii. 1. does not appear to be there speaking concerning the purchase of the Redeemer's blood,—the name or title, Lord (Gr. *despotes*) is no where else applied to Christ in the New Testament *but to the Father*, as in Luke ii. 29. Acts iv. 24. 2 Tim. ii. 22. and especially in Jude, ver. 4,

\* "There are many IN the church, who notwithstanding are not OF the church, and therefore at length shall be cast out: But the full and perfect cleansing of them is deferred to the last day." BEZA.

where, *the only Lord God*, is distinguished from, *our Lord Jesus Christ*. And even though it could be proved to apply to Christ in the above text, it may be explained upon the principle, that it is no unusual thing with the inspired writers, to speak of things, not as they actually are, but according to the profession of the party. Thus for instance, Mat. xiii. 12. *Whosoever hath*, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance; but *whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath*—that is, “which he seemed to have,” as explained in Luke viii. 18. Thus apostates are said to be *twice dead*, which would seem to import that they *had been* spiritually alive, though in fact that was never the case, but *merely* what they *professed* to be.

4. Even grant the premises, it follows, that such as *think* themselves redeemed, or are thought so by *others*, may blaspheme and *perish*; yet this makes not all the world redeemed: this can by no means establish the doctrine of UNIVERSAL REDEMPTION.

### TRIAL OF ELI BRUCE AND OTHERS,

*For a Conspiracy to Kidnap and Carry off William Morgan.*

We promised in our last to give a report of this trial in our present number; but we find that it will occupy too much room, if inserted entire: And, on a more critical examination, we think it will answer our design equally well to give such extracts from the testimony as go to establish the fact that Morgan was taken off by Masonic conspirators.

#### ONTARIO GENERAL SESSIONS.

AUGUST 20, 1828.

Judge HOWELL, presiding.

Mr Whiting having opened the case to the Jury, on behalf of the People, the following testimony was introduced.

*Israel R. Hall*, sworn.—The witness was Gaoler of Ontario county in 1826. He knew William Morgan who was committed to the gaol of said county, on the 10th of September, in that year, and discharged on the 12th of the same month, as this witness has been informed. Witness was absent from the gaol at the time of Morgan's commitment and discharge.

*Jeffrey Chipman*, sworn.—Witness was a Justice of the Peace in Canandaigua, in September 1826.—On the morning of the 10th of that month, it being Sunday, Nicholas G. Chesebro came to the witness' house and requested him to go to his office. He did so. Chesebro came in soon, and shortly after him, Ebenezer C. Kingsley, who made a complaint against William Morgan for larceny: Chesebro stated that Morgan had come from Batavia, and was, at that time, about six miles west of Canandaigua. Witness issued a warrant against Morgan, directed to the sheriff.

or either of the constables of Ontario county, or to Nicholas G. Chesebro, one of the coroners thereof, by virtue of which he was apprehended, brought before witness, on Monday evening, and by him discharged for want of sufficient proof to convict him. Chesebro then requested of witness a warrant against Morgan, on a demand which he held against him as assignee of Aaron Ackley. A warrant was accordingly issued, Morgan arrested, judgment entered up against him by his consent, execution thereon taken out and given to Holloway Hayward, then being a constable in Canandaigua.

*Holloway Hayward*, sworn.—The witness was a constable of the town of Canandaigua in 1826. He received the warrant issued against Morgan on the charge of larceny; went to Batavia with five others of whom Chesebro was one, arrested Morgan at that place, brought him before Mr. Chipman on Monday, was present during a part of his examination, received the execution against Morgan, arrested him by virtue of it, and committed him to the gaol of Ontario county, between 8 and 9 o'clock in the evening of the 11th of September.

*Mary W. Hall*, sworn.—She is the wife of the gaoler; she was not at home when Morgan was committed; she came home on Tuesday the 12th of Sept. and found him in gaol; Mr. Hall went out about dark on the evening of that day; a person came to the gaol and inquired for Mr. Hall; she told him he had gone from home; the person then wished to go into Morgan's room, which she refused; he then asked permission to have a private conversation with Morgan, which was also refused; he then insisted on paying the debt for which he was imprisoned, and taking him away; this too was refused. The person then went in search of Mr. Hall and soon returned without finding him, and again requested her to permit him to pay the debt and take Morgan away, to which she would not consent; he then asked her whether she would discharge him if Col. Sawyer would say it was right, witness did not say she would or would not. The person went away and soon came back with Col. Sawyer. Chesebro advised witness to let Morgan go. Lawson paid the amount for which Morgan was imprisoned, which was a little more than three dollars; stranger went to the door and whistled, witness unlocked the door of Morgan's room, and Lawson went in and led Morgan into the hall of the gaol, by the arm; after they went out of the door, and before it was shut, she heard the cry of murder; she went to the door, and saw three men taking Morgan east; he was struggling, his hat fell off, and one of them took it up; she saw no other person about the gaol. An unknown person rapped on the well curb, and a carriage soon passed by the gaol from the west. It went east and shortly returned, driven with great rapidity. This took place about 9 in the evening of the 12th of September. She has not seen Morgan since.

*Willis Turner*, sworn.—In September 1826, witness lived with Mr. Freeman Atwater in the street on which the jail is situated, a little west of it, and on the same side of the road. As he came out of Atwater's gate one evening, he met Chesebro and Sawyer going west; saw Sawyer pick up a stick; they turned about and

went to the west corner of the jail, and were there whispering together. Witness went to Mr. Hall's well which is in the street a little west of the jail, for water, and as he was turning the water into his pail, he heard the cry of murder: he saw three men coming down the jail steps with their arms locked. Heard the cry of murder once while they were coming down the steps, and twice after they had left them. Mrs. Hall was standing in the door; some one, he believes Chesebro, stopped the mouth of the man who cried murder: when they had gone a little distance from the steps, the middle man of the three appeared to hang back, his hat fell off, and a Mr. Osborn took it up and gave it to Sawyer; asked Sawyer what the rumpus was, who replied that a man had been arrested for debt and was unwilling to go. Saw Sawyer rap on the well curb; Hubbard's carriage soon drove by rapidly to the east with Hubbard driving; the horses were gray, and the curtains down. The carriage went a little beyond the pound east of the jail and turned about. A man was put in by four others, who then got in and the carriage drove west and went round the corner of the tavern then kept by Mr. Kingsley; witness followed the men as they went east: was near the pound when they got into the carriage. It turned round before they got in. As the carriage was returning west, some one in it cried out, "Hubbard, why don't you drive faster; damn you, why don't you drive faster." Hubbard then cracked his whip. Had seen Morgan, but did not know whether he was the man taken from the jail; did not know those who came down the steps. The moon shone bright.

*Hiram Hubbard sworn.*—In Sept, 1826, the witness kept a livery stable in Canandaigua. He was applied to by Mr. Chauncey H. Coe, to take a party to Rochester on the 12th of September, and was paid for it last summer or fall by Mr. Nicholas G. Chesebro. His was a yellow two horse carriage; gray horses.—He was directed to go on the Palmyra road. He started about 9 o'clock in the evening; pleasant and the moon shone. About 50 or 60 rods east of the jail, his party, supposed to be 5 in number, got in; heard no noise. He knew none of his party, nor where they came from, and has not known them since. Can't say he saw them get in the carriage. On his way to Rochester, he first stopt at Brace's six miles from Canandaigua, to water; stopped at Beach's, in Victor; at Mendon, no body up; stopped at Pittsford to water; don't remember whether any of his party got out beyond Brace's. He stopt at Rochester, 10 or 12 minutes, just at twilight. Some of the party got out here, but he don't know whether any went from the carriage; he saw no one of them then that he knew, and has seen none since to recognize them. The party desired him to go on beyond Rochester. He consented to go. He took the Lewiston road: on arriving at Hanford's which was then a tavern, one of the party got out. He called for feed for his horses, but got none; he went about 80 or 100 rods beyond the house and stopt, near a place of woods: It was not a usual stopping place: the party got out before he turned his carriage; he thinks he must have seen them, but he saw no one that he knew, and has seen no one of them since; he don't know why he stopped at that place, but presumes his party told him to do so.

*Esra Platt*, sworn.—In September 1826, the witness kept a livery stable at Rochester. He is a mason and a member of a chapter. A lodge had previously been established at Lewiston, and a chapter was expected to be installed at that place. About 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning of the day, or day but one, before the Lewiston installation, some person called at his front door, and said he wanted a carriage to go to Lewiston, and desired it might be sent to Ensworth's, where the company was. He then went away immediately. The witness called up his driver, whose name was Parker. The driver had been in witness' employ several months, but left him a month or two afterwards, on account of sore eyes. He don't know where he lives now. The carriage was sent soon after it was called for. The witness did not see it start. The only charge he made was on the paper in his wallet, in these words, "Grand Chapter pro tempore, to carriage to Lewiston." He supposed the carriage was for the Chapter, and expected some one, in its behalf, would pay him, but he has not been paid and has never asked any person to pay him.

*Henry Olmstead*, sworn.—He resided at Greece near Handford's landing in September 1826. One morning of that month, just at daylight, he saw a carriage with a pair of gray horses, in the road south of Handford's. The horses were very sweaty and appeared to be much fatigued. The curtains of the carriage were drawn. There were two men on the box. He did not know either of them. Does not know how far it went beyond Handford's.

*Silas Walker*, sworn.—Witness lives on the river road, directly opposite the point where the ridge road intersects it. On the morning of the 12th of September, 1826, while talking with Mr. Olmstead, he saw a yellow carriage with gray horses pass by.—When it returned the curtains were up; there were four or five persons in it, one of whom he knew to be Burrage Smith. A person on Mr. Platt's brown mare, was forward of the carriage; he saw no other carriage that morning, having been from home most of the time.

*Silas Walbridge*, sworn.—He lived, in 1826, in Clarkson, about 15 miles from the River road. Near the time of the Races which commenced, that year, on the 14th of September, he was applied to by a gentleman for a pair of horses to go before a hack, which he stated would arrive between 8 and 10 o'clock in the morning. The gentleman said he did not want a driver; witness at first declined letting his horses go without a driver, but finally consented, harnessed his horses about 8 o'clock, and tied them under his shed; the hack came along between 8 and 10 o'clock, and when it approached his house, the gentleman went along by the side of it, and had some conversation with the driver who soon drove on. He then said he did not want the horses. A person, since dead, told witness what was to take place, and when the hack came in sight, pointed it out to him. The hack was of a dark colour, and the horses dark bay.

*Sarah Wilder*, sworn.—The witness lived, in September 1826, with captain Isaac Allen, about five miles east from Clarkson. Allen does not keep tavern, and there are no houses near him. About the 11th or 12th of September in that year, at 10 or 11

o'clock in the forenoon, Mr.—came and inquired for capt. Allen; did not know where he was; Mr.—went hastily in pursuit of him, halloed for him, soon found him and returned after the hack. The hack came up before the house in about 15 minutes. It was brown, and the horses were brown: the curtains were down, and the day was very warm. Did not know the driver. Capt. Allen's horses were brought up, and Capt. Allen and Mr.—changed the horses; those that came with the hack were put in capt. Allen's barn. The hack went west and Mr.—with it, and returned about an hour before sunset the next day. The curtains were up and no one in it. Capt. Allen had gone to Clarkson, but had told witness where the horses that came with the hack the preceding day, might be found. They were put to it again and the hack returned to the east. Don't know who was with it when it returned.

*William Cooper*, sworn.—Witness lives in Clarkson. About the middle of September 1826, coming from the west he passed a carriage and two pair of horses in the road about four miles west of Clarkson, and about one third of the distance from Capt. Allen's to Mr. Spencers. It was between 11 and 12 o'clock in the forenoon; does not recollect the day of the month, but it was near the time of the races that year. They were then training horses on the race grounds. He cannot say whether the horses were attached to the carriage or not; they appeared to be changing them. A man on the box whom he had never seen before, was holding the lines; one span of horses was capt. Allen's; the other he did not know. The weather was very warm, and the curtains of the carriage were down. There were four or five men in a lot south of the ridge road conversing; two about 15 rods from the carriage, the others nearer.—Two of them were sitting, the others standing: witness knew several of the men, capt. Allen, Mr. Spencer Mr.—. He afterwards thought that another's name was Augur, but is not positive of it; the carriage did not start while he saw it.

*William Molyneaux*, sworn.—In September 1826 witness lived in Fleming, Niagara county, on the ridge road, at a point where it is intersected by the road from Lockport a little more than 12 miles from Lewiston, 6 from Solomon C. Wright's, and 6 or 7 from Lockport. On the night before, or the night after the insatillation, about 12 o'clock, Eli Bruce, who then lived at Lockport, came to witness' house with two strangers. Bruce came up stairs where witness was in bed, and said some of his friends were going to Lewiston, and asked him for a change of horses; Bruce told witness that they should be used carefully. Witness called up his son and after consulting with him, concluded to let Bruce have his horses; Bruce and witness' son got up the horses; does not know from what place the carriage came, nor whether Bruce went on with it; one of Bruce's companions stayed over night at witness' house, and took care of the horses that were with the carriage, and helped change them when it returned: does not know who drove; Bruce spoke of Brown as the driver. The horses returned the next morning, a little before sunrise, in the charge of brown. The carriage was large, and of a dark Brown or black colour. He saw no person but Bruce and the two stran-

gers that came with him. Can't say which road the carriage took in the morning, nor how many were in it. Did not see Bruce again till the next winter. Brown said Bruce would pay for the horses; witness has not been paid: has an account with Bruce.

*Corydon Fox*, sworn.—In September 1826, the witness lived at Lewiston, with Mr. Barton in the capacity of a stage driver. The night before, or night after, the installation, between 10 and 12 o'clock, Mr. Barton called witness up and told him to get his hack and horses ready to go to Youngstown. When he was ready, Bruce got on the box with him, and directed him to drive into a back street, to a carriage which he found standing there without any horses attached to it. He drove by the carriage in the back street. Some persons were standing near it, one or two got out of it, and after they and Bruce had got in his hack, Bruce told him to drive to Col. Kings, about 6 miles distant. He would have noticed violence if there had been any, but he saw none; saw nothing brought from the carriage in the road, to his hack. On arriving at King's, he stopt by direction of Bruce, who got out and called to King, who came down into the hall, where he and Bruce conversed together. While they were conversing, some one in the carriage asked for water, in a whining voice, to which Bruce answered; "You shall have some in a moment." King and Bruce then got in, and he drove to the burying ground, about three quarters of a mile from King's and half a mile from the fort, where he stopt by Bruce's direction. There were no houses near. The party, four in number, got out, and proceeded, side by side, towards the fort, and witness, by Bruce's orders, returned to Lewiston, where he arrived before daylight. The witness was often called up late at night, and frequently drove passengers whom he did not know; but it is not usual to take up a party in the back street; and he never before left a party at the burying ground which is not an ordinary stopping place. The next day, he saw Bruce at the Frontier House in Lewiston. Knows not what became of the carriage in the road. Saw nothing unusual in the manner of getting in and out of his hack.

The witness was asked whether he was taken into the lodge soon after this occurrence, but the court said the question was improper, and it was not answered.\*

*Ebenezer Perry*, sworn.—Lives in Lewiston, on Back Ridge-street. On the night following the 13th of September 1826, after 12 o'clock, he saw a person harnessing a carriage at Barton's stable, heard it start, and went to the door. Saw a carriage coming, which went a little distance beyond another standing in the street without horses, and stopt. Two men were on the box.—One of them he knew to be Corydon Fox, and the other he recognized at an examination at Lockport, about two months afterwards, and ascertained to be Eli Bruce. Witness thought something strange was going on and went into his garden near his house, where he had a view of what took place in the road.—Saw a man go from the box of the carriage which had driven by, to the one standing in the street, and open the door. Some one

\* See our last number page 189.

got out backwards by the assistance of two in the carriage. He had no hat, but a handkerchief on his head, and appeared intoxicated and helpless. They went to Fox's carriage and got in.—The man he supposed to be drunk, was helped in. One went back and took something from the carriage they had left; he thinks a jug; returned; got in, they drove off; and he saw no more of them. Witness saw no person in the unharnessed carriage, the curtains being down. Said nothing about what he had seen for four or five months.

*John Jackson*, sworn.—In the fall of 1826, he lived in Lockport. The night before the installation he stayed at Giddins', his brother in law: went to installation; don't know whether Giddins went; before going to the installation he went with Giddins to the magazine; 20 or 30 minutes previously to setting out, Giddins had a pistol; requested witness to take it; he declined; did not see Giddins lay it aside; did not see it after they left the house: Giddins carried something with him; don't know what; witness approached within about 2 rods of the magazine; Giddins went up to the door; don't know whether it was opened by Giddins or not; something was said inside of the door; he heard a man's voice not uncommonly loud, and supposed a man was in the magazine; don't know what was said, nor whether he heard the voice before or after Giddins reached the door; thought he had better be missing, and immediately retreated. Giddins soon followed him; witness started in 10 or 12 minutes for Lewiston. Giddins informed witness whose pistol it was that he showed him, but the defendants' counsel objected to his repeating what Giddins had told him. He never had any conversation with either of the defendants respecting their participation in the abduction of Morgan.

The testimony on the part of the people closed here.

Mr. Whiting stated that the bill against Turner and Darrow, two of the defendants, had been found on the testimony of Giddins alone, and that he having been excluded, the prosecution has no evidence whatever against them.

Mr. Adams addressed the Jury in behalf of Bruce, and Mr. Moseley for the People. The Jury retired at 9 o'clock on Friday evening, after receiving a charge from his Honour Judge Howell; and having been absent about three hours, returned a verdict of **GUILTY** against *Bruce*, and **NOT GUILTY** in favour of *Turner* and *Darrow*.

The Court suspended their judgment against Bruce in order to take the advice of the Supreme Court on some important questions of law which were raised during the trial.

The testimony of Giddins was excluded by the court on the ground that "he had not such a belief in the existence of an overruling Providence, and in a future state of rewards and punishments, as the law requires." He appears to have no religious belief whatever. *David Morrisson* testified, that Giddins declared "his belief that there was no God, and nothing divine superior to matter;" and produced in confirmation, a letter proved to have been written by Giddins to Morrisson, dated *April* 1827, which Mor-

risson said "he did not answer. He had never, in correspondence, responded to the sentiments of Giddins." And yet, strange as it may appear, a letter was produced, which Morrisson admitted to be genuine, dated June 1827, addressed to Giddins, and signed *David Morrisson*, in which we find the following expressions: "I am much *pleased* with your notion of virtue and vice;\* they were correctly demonstrated according to my understanding of the two, as well as the character and guardianship of the Deity." "I shall be *pleased* to hear from you again on this subject." Another letter, written by Giddins to his wife, directly appeals to the overruling Providence of God. How miserable is the condition of those who reject the testimony which God has given to this sinful and wretched world! They know not what they believe. Like fools they live, and like fools they must perish. "Their feet are swift to *shed blood*: Destruction and misery are in their ways." Rom. iii. 15, 16.

The testimony of *Hiram Hubbard*, is particularly worthy of notice. He appears to be a most stupid man, (for one that knew enough to drive a carriage,) to start off at 9 o'clock in the evening, and drive all night, without knowing for what purpose, or who employed him, or where he was going, or the *precise* number of his party! Can't say he saw them get into the carriage—stopt in plain daylight, near a place of woods—*thinks* he *must* have seen them get out, but saw no one that he knew, and don't know why he stopt at that place, but *presumes* that his party told him to do so! Strange! But, never having been enlightened by the *sublime* science of Free Masonry, perhaps we are incompetent to judge.

#### ASSOCIATE REFORMED CHURCH.

The *Religious Examiner* for August contains the following article:

"In the *Religious Monitor*, for May 1828, (a periodical paper, conducted under the especial superintendence of the Associate Church,) we have the following paragraph:

"At the commencement of this Synod (meaning the Associate Reformed Synod of North America) they professed that it was their real intention to carry with them all the judicial testimonies, against defection from the faith, emitted in the present age, by their brethren in Britain: and to avail themselves of every call to bear a pointed testimony against the errors and delusions which prevail in this country. THIS PLEDGE HAS NEVER BEEN REDEEMED."

"So says a Seceder. We would ask, is this a specimen of the writer's mendacity, or of his ignorance? If the former, he is to

\* These notions of virtue and vice, and the guardianship of Deity, are as follows: "That with God there can be no difference or distinction between beauty and deformity, virtue and vice, perfection and imperfection—that prayers are but mockery to his name," &c.—*Giddins' Letter*.

be abhorred, if the latter, he is to be pitied. In either case, however, we might covet the fellowship of many in that branch of the church, we do assure him HE is very welcome to a *separate communion* from us. But further this same writer adds—

‘They have no testimony (other than the Westminster Confession) recognizing the judicial testimonies emitted by the Secession or Reformed Churches in Britain, against defections from that instrument, and though errors and delusions innumerable have risen up in these United States, even in Churches which profess to receive these same Westminster Standards, yet no testimony has been by her lifted up against them.’

“To reply to such a statement under such circumstances as do exist is certainly a most disagreeable task. The only reply that it merits, or indeed will bear, is an unqualified denial that it contains even a shadow of truth, and an appeal to matter of fact for evidence. Whether the correspondent of the editor of the *Religious Monitor*, had access to the Examiner I know not; but the editor himself had, and should, therefore, have been sufficiently instructed on the subject of the above statement to have suppressed the publication of it. A large part of each No. of the Religious Examiner has been occupied for some time, in republishing valuable testimonies that the Associate Reformed Synod, did publish against prevailing errors, and the half has not yet been told. I will venture to say that they have even been more vigilant in that way, than the Associate Brethren themselves. But perhaps they may choose to say that the testimonies emitted by the Associate Reformed church are unworthy of the name. Be it so, we are willing to compare Lexicographical accuracy with them; though as many in that Body are fond of contending about mere terms, we may not choose to go all their lengths in wrangling about words. I would just observe that it is well for the slandered, in any case, when they cannot be exposed or proscribed, but upon the ground of misrepresentation.”

In the *July* number of this same Religious Examiner, we have the subjoined extract. The writer is labouring to show, in the face of acknowledged facts, that the charge brought against the Associate Reformed church, that she has no testimony, is not well founded.

“Can any Church be without a testimony, which adheres to the Confession, Catechisms, Directory for worship, and form of Presbyterian church government, and requires a profession of adherence thereto, as terms of admission to membership?”

Now, we ask, is not the above question based on the acknowledgment, that the Associate Reformed church has no other testimony than the Confession? It surely is. What, then, becomes of the “mendacity,” or “ignorance,” of our correspondent? For he only asserts, that “they have no other testimony than the Westminster Confession.” And this is a truth more than once acknowledged by the Religious Examiner. Indeed, so little is the doubt on this subject, that the Associate Synod judicially sanctioned its truth, at their last meeting, by adopting a similar

statement, in a note to the Narrative prefixed to their testimony. But let us continue the extract from this writer.

"And have any of the churches discovered a more watchful care to oppose error when doing mischief, than they have done by occasional acts, shewing their contrariety to the word of God and their constitution and standards? We believe all, who find fault with our mode of bearing testimony, approve of the doctrines of the above mentioned acts, and that every candid reader will admit that they have been prepared with *great wisdom*."

"One objection to our mode of testifying in occasional acts, is, that they are *not made terms of communion*."

"Our reason for this is, that they sometimes contain reasonings too intricate for weak christians to judge correctly of their import; and yet such reasoning is often necessary to confute errorists, and may be very useful to warn against mistake, and direct presbyteries and sessions, to exclude from communion such as countenance error."

Now we have the whole ground before us, which may be thus stated: Our correspondent says the Associate Reformed church has no testimony other than the Confession, &c. and the Examiner denies that this statement "contains even a shadow of truth," although in a former number of that work, the same writer *virtually acknowledged*, that the Associate Reformed church had no testimony other than the Confession! A case like this should admonish all of us to be cautious how we charge our neighbours of being guilty of absolute falsehood, in the unqualified manner this writer has done, especially if our memories be no better than his *appears* to be.

It excites less indignation than grief, to see a minister of the gospel flounder through the meshes of his own setting, in the disingenuous manner that this writer has, in order to fix the charge of falsehood upon our correspondent. He has, it is true, clearly shown us, that the Associate Reformed Synod has passed "*occasional acts*" which are not terms of communion. And why? Because they are drawn with such "*great wisdom*"—"that they sometimes contain reasonings too intricate for weak Christians to judge correctly of their import!"\* This brings to our recollection

\* Why not descend from this "*great wisdom*," this lofty eminence of metaphysical subtlety, and human labyrinths, to the plain, simple, and easy to be understood statements, of gospel truth. In these, we are assured, "the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err." And we have been in the habit of supposing, that while the highest intellect could not form *adequate*, the humblest, enlightened by the Spirit of grace, might form *accurate*, conceptions of divine truth. Besides, we are unable to discover that any benefit can be derived from the confutation of errorists, by "reasonings too intricate" for people to understand; for we have always thought it necessary to use arguments that can be understood, if we would produce conviction. But perhaps we do not comprehend the writer; we will not, therefore, be too confident in passing judgment upon documents "that every candid reader will admit have been prepared with *great wisdom*."

a charge which we have somewhere seen seriously brought against a certain body of professed Christians, because they withheld the scriptures from the people, for the same reason; but we have never heard *this* charge brought against the Associate Reformed church; and, therefore, the natural inference is, that she considers her "occasional acts" wiser, or at least, more "*intricate*," than "the law and the testimony." But inasmuch as this cannot be the case, we are inclined to think, that the plea of "great wisdom" is brought for the want of a better excuse for not maintaining a judicial testimony against the wide-spread, and destructive errors and defection of the times. As respects the wisdom of their "occasional acts," we have nothing to say; but we must confess that it requires greater wisdom than has fallen to our lot, to discover how any church can maintain a testimony for truth, without making it a term of communion. Nor can we see that any advantage is to be derived from the "*great wisdom*" employed in the formation of such instruments, if they be not made terms of communion. Indeed, the Koran of the Mahometans or the Shaster of the Hindoos, would answer every purpose. This is sober, solemn truth, or else reason has lost her empire, and human judgment has become idiocy. Why then should such instruments be called a testimony?

But we need not wonder at this propensity for dead-letter standards. It is the fashion of the times. Moreover, it is the legitimate offspring of the Associate Reformed church. And this we shall endeavour to show. On the 9th day of April 1746, the Associate Synod of Scotland judicially condemned "a swearing the religious clause of some burgess oaths;"\* and this decision was acknowledged by the Burghers, at that time and long after, to be lawful; and the only excuse they could offer for their subsequent opposition to it, was, that it was come to by a *thin* Synod.† After this decision, and previous to the final separation, the Burgher party vehemently insisted that the following question should be put to vote, viz. "Whether the foresaid decision of Synod should be a term of ministerial and christian communion, or not?"‡ And had the Synod voted "not," in all probability the rupture would never have taken place. Thus we see that this principle originated with the very existence of the Burghers; but remained to be more fully carried out, by their descendants, the Associate Reformed Synod of North America.

\* Gib's Display, vol. ii. page 20.

† Re-Exhibition, page 261.

‡ Gib's Display, vol. ii. page 43.

But, says the writer in the Examiner, these occasional acts—"may be very useful to warn against mistake," and "to exclude from communion such as countenance error." True, they *may* do this, and they *may* not—they *may* be regarded, and they *may* be, nay, they *are*, disregarded. For example:

The Examiner for August contains one of these "occasional acts on Psalmody," from which we copy the following sentences for the purpose of showing its practical effect upon the conduct of the members of the Associate Reformed Synod.

"It is the will of God that the sacred songs of scripture be used in his worship to the end of the world. The substitution of devotional songs composed by uninspired men, in the place of these sacred songs, is therefore a corruption of the worship of God."

During the summer which has now passed, a minister, who is a member of the same ecclesiastical body that enacted the above, travelled from west of the Alleghany mountains, to the city of Albany, for the purpose of preaching to a congregation belonging to the General Assembly. And in doing so, he sung Watts' (or Dwight's as they are now called,) Psalms and Hymns. If the truth of this be questioned, we can give names. Here, then, we have a practical exhibition of the effect of these "occasional acts," which are not terms of communion. Now, so far as such "occasional acts," or the discipline of the Associate Reformed church are concerned, this minister has acted perfectly in character. But how far such conduct goes to confirm the charge of *insincerity*, which has been so frequently brought against the friends of a scripture Psalmody, by the advocates of human compositions, we shall not now stop to enquire.

There are many other things, in the July and August numbers of the Examiner, equally disingenuous with the extracts that head this article, which we forbear to notice; because we have no desire to anticipate our correspondent, *Amicus Veritatis*, and because it has been with the greatest reluctance that we have touched on this subject at all. But it seemed an imperious duty. We have aimed to abstain from that impeachment of motives, and those harsh epithets and railing accusations, which have so greatly distinguished the Ohio publication. And if we have made misstatements, or reasoned falsely, we can only say that it has not been designed. For when reviling and misrepresentation assume the place of candour and sound argument, truth must suffer, and the children of God be grieved, and sinners hardened. Much rather, therefore, should we have desired that the Monitor had continued, as it has done for the last four years, to pursue its

course without controversy with the Associate Reformed church. And we hope that our correspondent, in his future Strictures, will carefully avoid all such modes of expression as have the appearance of harshness. Feeling is not so easily suppressed, unless we are under the influence of a spirit of indifference.

The late unsuccessful attempt at a union between the Associate and the Associate Reformed churches, appears to be the main-spring of that unsparing censure, and impeachment of motives which our Associate Reformed brethren have recently brought against us. They will not unite with us on the ground of *our* Testimony, neither are they content to remain separate, and allow that we are governed by pure motives in refusing to unite with them on the ground of *their* testimony of occasional, free communion acts. If they are honest in supposing their mode of testifying sufficient, let them adhere to it; but let them not impeach the motives of such as think it utterly insufficient. We fear that human ambition, worldly policy, and an overweening spirit of proselytism, or for increase of numbers, more than the glory of God, are at the bottom of all this. These are principles so inherent in human nature, that they cannot be too sedulously guarded against. For our part, we consider increase of numbers in a particular church, comparatively nothing, when contrasted with the importance of maintaining their ground. We had infinitely rather see the Associate church remain stationary in this respect, than to see her drop one single article of her public profession, unless such article shall be clearly manifested to be unscriptural. Let us, then, hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering, and be ever in readiness, to give with meekness, to those that oppose us, a reason of the hope that is in us. For, who will pretend to estimate the benefit that actually does result to the great interests of religion generally, from the sincere and faithful contendings of a few? Or, who will pretend to estimate the magnitude of those evils which may overwhelm the visible church, should the last remnant of a covenanted reformation, —the few broken fragments of a once glorious Secession, give way to that mournful neutrality in the cause of God, and that detestable indifference to truth, which so greatly distinguishes the day in which we live, and which has broken down and destroyed the hedges round about Zion—*So that all they which pass by the way do pluck her? The boar out of the wood doth waste her, and the wild beast of the field doth devour her. O Lord God of hosts, how long wilt thou be angry against the prayer of thy people? Thou makest us a strife unto our neighbours; and our ENEMIES laugh among themselves.*

*From the Magazine of the Reformed Dutch Church.*

### SCOTLAND.

The Kirk of Scotland has appointed a committee to propose a new version of the psalms. And it is probable that she will venture on the perilous experiment of giving her people a new psalmody. One minister has already come out against the project. It will, he thinks, drive their people into the folds of the Union Secession Church. Dr. Mc'Crie has been at the head of a small sect which went off from the Anti-Burgher Synod, with him and the late venerable Professor Bruce, of Whitburn, at their head. Mr. Paxton, well known by his valuable work on Oriental customs, is at the head of the party which stood out, *dentibus et unguibus*, against the happy union of the two great seceder bodies. These two learned men have brought their respective corps together, and have formed a respectable small society, known, I believe, by the name of the Constitutional Seceders. The Associate Church of North America (the Scottish Seceder Church,) has hitherto inclined to throw itself, into the communion of this last mentioned body of Scottish Seceders, and to reject all overtures of union with the Associate Union Synod of Edinburgh. It is to be hoped, however, that a very different spirit will prevail in the next Synod of that eminently orthodox and pious body, from that which prevailed in its late Synods.

We know not what information Dr. Brownlee may have in his possession to justify the hope expressed, "that a very different spirit will prevail in our next Synod," in relation to "the Associate Union Synod of Edinburgh;" but we can assure him that there is no more foundation for such a hope, than there is for a hope that they will unite with the Reformed Dutch church, at their next meeting.

### ON LONG ARTICLES.

THE following article from the Pandect, a religious paper recently established at Cincinnati, Ohio, reminds us of an anecdote which is related of the late Dr. Nesbit, president of the College at Carlisle, Penn. Dr. Nesbit had been in the habit of preaching sermons of the old fashioned length, in Scotland, which bordered upon two hours. This was a great annoyance to the good people of Carlisle. Accordingly a deputation of elders was commissioned to wait upon the doctor, and procure, if possible, a relief from the grievance of which they complained. The Dr. listened with perfect composure to their remonstrance, and when it was concluded he answered in his Scotch accent, that he well knew that a long sermon was a great bore to an ungodly folk—and begged the deputation to fix upon the time with which they would be satisfied. An hour was at length agreed upon; and ever after, whatever might be the subject, and indeed in the very midst of a paragraph, the Dr. would abruptly brake off by saying: "Brethren *your hour is out*."—[*Charleston Ob.*]

"It is said the articles published are too long. This fault, if it be one, can be easily corrected. If the *great* matters of religion—the *vast* concerns of eternity, are to occupy the *least* portion of our time and attention, then let every religious periodical be a mere *scrap-book*. But if a man in heaven's account is a fool who lays up treasure on earth, and is not rich towards God—if every one is bound by the solemnities of a judgment to come "to hold fast a form of sound words"—"to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints"—and to shut the mouths of gainsayers—to comfort the feeble minded, and support the weak—then there must be system, argument, proof, illustration, and appeal—and of course some articles must be long. Specimens of the successful publication of short articles have been presented to us. Two of these are before us. One, it is said, has seven thousand, and another ten thousand subscribers. In examining every article in these specimens, we see but two or three that are worth reading. No doubt other numbers of these papers are more richly laden with valuable materials—but the success of the editors by publishing mere scraps, while it indeed seems like gathering up the fragments, illustrates a declaration of Christ, not very honourable to Christian professors—"the children in this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." Look at literary and political journals. Is it uncommon to publish articles stretching through from three to nine columns of a royal sheet, or from ten to twenty octavo pages? are not these read, and read with avidity? Are not many of them retained in memory, and retailed in conversation? Look at your novel readers. Can they not tell you the contents of dozens and

almost scores of volumes, which they have devoured over the midnight lamp ?

But see another class of facts. A physician may spend a whole night with his patient—a lawyer may argue seven hours for his client, and it is all well ; but let an advocate for benevolent societies, or a minister of Christ, speaking for the salvation of souls, argue an hour, or publish an article longer than a man's finger, and it is all tedious and wearisome. Yes, yes ; let every thing but the matters of eternity be long—but let them be short—the least, the last of all !!

**PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.**—It appears by the Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of May, 1828, that this body consists, at present, of 16 Synods, 90 Presbyteries, 1285 ministers, 194 licentiates, 242 candidates, 1,968 churches, and 146,308 communicants. The whole number of new communicants the past year, was 15,095. Whole number of adults baptized 3,389 ; infants baptized 10,790. Missionary funds raised \$23,993 69 ; Commissioners' funds, \$2,851 36 ; Presbyterial funds, \$516 13 ; Theological Seminary funds, \$3,358 69 ; Education funds, \$8,023 29.

*The Theatre.*—The Providence Investigator, alluding to some remarks which had been made by another paper, relative to Theatrical representations says :

The Journal sees nothing in a well regulated Theatre, at variance with pure ethics.—Neither do we. A "well regulated" Theatre will be regulated by "pure ethics." Let the Journal point us to such a Theatre, and it shall have our approbation ; though we fear it would lose most of its present supporters.

There is probably nothing in an honest footpad, "at variance with pure ethics." So there is nothing hurtful in an innoxious viper :—There is nothing black in a white crow, and there is nothing cold in a red-hot icicle. The difficulty lies in finding the precious articles.

#### PROPOSED PUBLICATION.

Proposals have been issued in this City for publishing a "Volume of Discourses," by the Rev. Dr. Bruce, Principal of the Western University of Pennsylvania. The work will comprise about three hundred duodecimo pages. The following are the subjects to be discussed, being a short system of divinity: The Duties of Ministers and People: The Resurrection of Christ: The Divinity of Christ: The Redemption accomplished by Christ, in four discourses: The New Birth, and Holy Life consequent upon it: On Christian Love; and on the Blessing of God to his People. It will be printed on good type and paper and substantially bound. The price to subscribers will be \$1, or a discount of ten per cent. to persons who subscribe and pay for ten copies.

*Pittsburgh Spectator.*

#### DREADFUL ACCIDENT AND LOSS OF LIVES AT KIRKALDY IN SCOTLAND.

A most dreadful accident occurred at Kirkaldy, on Sunday last, [15th June] the disastrous consequences of which, equal, if not exceed those produced by the fall of the Brunswick Theatre, some months back. From the particulars which have reached us through a correspondent, it appears that the celebrated Mr. Irving who had been for some weeks back in the active exercise of his ministry through different parts of Scotland, was announced to preach at Kirkaldy on the days of Saturday and Sunday, which naturally attracted numerous congregations. On the evening of the latter, the Chapel was crowded at an early hour to hear [we believe] his farewell sermon. Service had not commenced when the fears of the congregation were excited by a sudden cracking of the beams which supported one of the galleries. The alarm of danger was instantly succeeded by its reality. The gallery gave way, and was precipitated with the whole of its occupants into the body of the church. The results were terrific, and the sacrifice of life awfully great. The rush to the doors was tremendous, and in the struggle for life and death, *twenty-nine* persons are stated to have died from pressure and suffocation. Three were crushed to death by the falling beams and numbers have received severe contusions. The consternation in the town and neighbourhood when our correspondent's letter came off was great beyond example. Anxious solicitude was in every face, and inquiry in every mouth, while the grief of the relatives and friends of the sufferers, [among whom was a mother, whose *three* daughters perished on the occasion] added considerably to the melancholy and heartrending features of the scene.—*Gore's Liverpool Advertiser, June 19.*